


COLLEGE OF THE PACIFIC



Muto Fund in
Japanese - American
Relations



College of the Pacific
Stockton, Calif.

Rising Japan

Is She a Menace

or

A Comrade to be Welcomed in the
Fraternity of Nations?

By

Jabez T. Sunderland, M.A., D.D.

Billings Lecturer (1913-14) in Japan, China, and India

With a Foreword by

Lindsay Russell

President of the Japan Society

G. P. Putnam's Sons

New York and London

The Knickerbocker Press

1918

College of the Pacific
Stockton, Calif.

COPYRIGHT, 1918

BY

JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND

DS

849

U658

The Knickerbocker Press, New York

44410 13 Sept 1927

This

BOOK IS RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED

TO

DR. CLAY MACCAULEY

OF TOKYO

CLERGYMAN, SCHOLAR, AND AUTHOR, LOYAL CITIZEN OF THE
UNITED STATES AND TRUE FRIEND OF JAPAN


AND TO

BARON EI-ICHI SHIBUSAWA

OF TOKYO

FINANCIER, EDUCATOR, AND PHILANTHROPIST, LOYAL CITIZEN
OF JAPAN AND TRUE FRIEND OF AMERICA

The value of the service rendered by these two eminent men in bringing the two great neighbour nations, Japan and the United States, into better acquaintance with each other, and therefore into more permanently friendly and helpful relations, can hardly be overestimated.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024

20248
FOREWORD

Pe 327.7352

847

THIS thoughtful and interesting book by Dr. Sunderland will serve a timely purpose in the interpretation of Japan and in the refutation of the many malicious falsehoods circulated about that country. It is fortunate that this publication follows so closely the startling disclosures of our own Department of State, and the pointed observation of Viscount Ishii, of the Special Mission of Japan which has recently visited the United States, that: "The agent of Germany in this country and in ours has had as his one purpose the feeding of our passions, our prejudices, and our distrust on a specially prepared German concoction, until, drugged and inflamed, we might have taken the irrevocable step over the edge, and at his leisure the vulture might have fattened upon our remains."

As a group of anti-Japanese writers has persistently attacked Japan and will probably continue to do so, the study of Japan's civilization

and a clear-sighted analysis of the policy of her rulers and the motives by which the Japanese people are impelled, are peculiarly valuable, particularly from so authoritative and trustworthy a student as Dr. Sunderland. Japanese statesmen and leaders in thought and action have pointed out with full frankness that nothing could be gained by Japan in planning aggression on our Pacific Coast, and I personally feel that, in view of experience in the present war, no sound thinker could believe that Japan could transport the necessary great armies with munitions and supplies over the five thousand miles of ocean and successfully invade and hold our Western shores. Viscount Ishii's recent clear enunciation of Japan's policy toward China leaves no cross-currents in our relations other than that of a just treatment of the sixty thousand Japanese in California and the slightly larger number in Honolulu who are rightfully resident there, and to whom, for their own protection, and also for the advantage of the United States, should be accorded citizenship. Their children become citizens automatically, and a similar privilege to the parents is but just and right.

In a recent speech in New York, Hon. Elihu Root said:

"I have not the slightest doubt that the misrepresentations and the attempts to create bad feeling between the United States and Japan have been very largely the result of a fixed and settled purpose. That purpose it seems to me formed a part of the policy of that great ruling caste of Germany which is attempting to subjugate the world today.

"For many years I was very familiar with our own department of foreign affairs, and for some years I was specially concerned in its operation. There were many incidents out of which quarrels and conflict might have arisen, and I hope you will remember what I say: I say that during all that period there never was a moment when the Government of Japan was not frank, sincere, friendly, and most solicitous not to enlarge but to minimize and do away with all causes of controversy. There never was a more consistent and noble advocacy of peace, of international friendship, and of real, good understanding in the diplomacy of this world than was exhibited by the representatives of Japan, both here and in Japan, during all these years in their relations to the United States. I wish for no better, no more frank and friendly intercourse between my own and other countries than the intercourse by which Japan in those years illustrated the best qualities of the new diplomacy between nations as distinguished from the old diplomacy as between rulers."

I feel that Dr. Sunderland, who for years has been a most painstaking student of the Far East, has rendered a great service in exposing the fictions and fabrications of writers, enemies of both Japan and the United States, who have been doing all in their power to sow seeds of dissension. Japan has been, perhaps, the most reluctant of all nations to come to her own defence when she has been slandered and maligned, a reluctance due in part, no doubt, to the barrier of language, but largely to the instinctive reserve of the Japanese and to their time-honored Bushido, the spirit of silence under attack. Moreover, in the entire United States there are but a few Japanese who can or will write effectively in defence of their country. There are few Americans who have the knowledge and inclination so to do.

Dr. Sunderland's monograph deserves the respectful attention of broad and intelligent readers both in our country and abroad.

LINDSAY RUSSELL,
President, Japan Society.

NEW YORK,
Nov. 20, 1917.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

	PAGE
THE CIVILIZATION OF ASIA	I
Who and What Are the Japanese?	

CHAPTER II

THE CIVILIZATION OF JAPAN	5
Japanese Civilization Compared with that of Europe and America.	

CHAPTER III

THE CIVILIZATION OF JAPAN (Continued)	17
Japanese Civilization Compared with that of Europe and America.	

CHAPTER IV

THE CIVILIZATION OF JAPAN (Concluded)	33
Japanese Civilization Compared with that of Europe and America.	

CHAPTER V

THE MENACE OF A JAPANESE INVASION OF AMERICA	50
How the Idea Arose	

CONTENTS

CHAPTER VI

	PAGE
THE MENACE OF A JAPANESE INVASION OF AMERICA (Continued)	58
How the Idea Arose.	

CHAPTER VII

THE MENACE OF A JAPANESE INVASION OF AMERICA (Continued).	80
Is Such an Invasion Probable? Is it Possible?	

CHAPTER VIII

THE MENACE OF A JAPANESE INVASION OF AMERICA (Concluded).	105
Is Such an Invasion Probable? Is it Possible?	

CHAPTER IX

THE MENACE OF JAPAN IN CHINA	128
Is Japan's Attitude Toward China Likely to Give Trouble to the United States?	

CHAPTER X

THE MENACE OF JAPAN IN CALIFORNIA	142
Are the Japanese in California a Local Danger? Are They a National Danger?	

CHAPTER XI

THE MENACE OF JAPAN IN CALIFORNIA (Con- tinued)	149
Are the Japanese in California a Local Danger? Are They a National Danger?	

CONTENTS

xi

CHAPTER XII

PAGE

THE MENACE OF JAPAN IN CALIFORNIA (Concluded)	160
---	-----

Are the Japanese in California a Local Danger? Are They a National Danger?

CHAPTER XIII

THE SOLUTION OF THE JAPANESE QUESTION IN CALIFORNIA	172
---	-----

I. National Control of Immigration

II. A New and Better Immigration Law.

CHAPTER XIV

THE MENACE OF JAPAN IN THE PHILIPPINES .	197
--	-----

Is There Danger of Japan Attempting to Seize the Philippine Islands?

CHAPTER XV

CONCLUSION OF THE WHOLE MATTER . . .	210
--------------------------------------	-----

INDEX	215
-----------------	-----

Rising Japan

CHAPTER I

THE CIVILIZATION OF ASIA

Who and What are the Japanese?

MANY persons in Europe and America find it hard to believe that Japan is a civilized land, at least in any such sense as applies to England or France or Germany or the United States. Why is this so? Is it not because Japan is located in Asia?

Europeans have long looked down upon Asia with a strange arrogance and semi-contempt, as if her peoples were inferior, as if her place in the world's civilization and the world's achievement were insignificant. But what are the facts?

Asia is the mother-continent of the world. She is the mother of the world's most important races,

including the races of Europe; she is the greatest mother of nations; she is the most important mother of languages; she is the mother of the alphabet and of letters; she is the mother of astronomy and navigation and mathematics and most of the arts and industries of the world; she is the mother of civilization, giving to the world its first great centres of enlightenment, many centuries before any part of Europe had emerged from barbarism; and when civilization began to penetrate Europe it was from Asia that it came. What is important, also, Asia is the mother of religions. All the world's great historic religious faiths are of Asiatic origin, not one arose on any other continent. Europe herself received both her Christianity and her Bible from Asia. Moses, David, Solomon, Isaiah, Paul, and Jesus were all Asiatics. Where then is there any ground for Europe's pride and arrogance when comparing herself with Asia?

If Japan were in Europe, and if we were accustomed to think of her people as belonging to our own so-called "white" race, we should not hesitate a moment to assign her a high place among civilized nations.

As a fact, she probably is related to our own

white Aryan race as distinctly as to any of the races that we call brown or yellow; for the best scientific authorities are now telling us that an important part of her blood is unquestionably Aryan. Still she has also Mongolian blood, and so our prejudice continues. Will our prejudice still continue when we learn, as our scientific investigators tell us we are likely soon to learn, that probably all of us, and all other Europeans, have Mongolian blood in our veins?

Some of us think of Japan as being very young, and of such civilization as she possesses as being very new, because we have been acquainted with her so short a time. But the truth is she is older than any present-day nation of Europe, and her civilization goes far back. ✓

She seems young to us because throughout most of her history until about the middle of the nineteenth century, when our Commodore Perry compelled her to open her ports to the trade of the western world, she had gone her own way, lived her own life, developed her own civilization according to her own ideals and her own genius, and maintained little intercourse with any countries except her neighbours, China and Korea.

Within the past sixty years, indeed, mainly

within the past fifty years, she has passed through a revolution which I think may justly be declared as remarkable as anything in the history of the world. She has not *become* civilized; she *was* civilized *before*. What has happened is, she has opened all her doors to a *new form* of civilization—the civilization of Europe and America—not to *supplant* her own, but to *supplement* it, to take from the new what seemed to her of most value, and with that enlarge, carry forward, and enrich her own. It required a strong and a great people to plan such an advance, such a transition, such a revolution, and carry it out, holding themselves steady, meanwhile, never being submerged, never being carried off their feet, never proving false to their own civilization or their own historic genius, and never losing or laying aside their own ideals, throughout all the long and trying transition period. That is what Japan has done.

CHAPTER II

JAPANESE CIVILIZATION

The Civilization of Japan Compared with that of Europe and America

LET us inquire with some care how the civilization of Japan compares with our own.

What are the marks of civilization?

The question is not easy to answer. Undoubtedly the marks of civilization are many. Competent persons attempting to give them would not name just the same. And yet there are certain marks, or tests, upon which almost all intelligent judges would agree.

Probably one of these, and standing nearly or quite first in the list, would be public order, general obedience to law on the part of the people.

What is to be said of Japan in this regard? There is only one possible answer. Obedience to law is more general and more perfect in Japan than in the United States. There is no nation in

Europe where public order is better maintained. All travellers notice this. All authorities agree upon it.

One of the tests of civilization, unquestionably, is intelligence—the general intelligence and education of the people. How does Japan stand this test? The answer is clear. For many years she has maintained a system of universal compulsory education. All her children from six to fourteen years of age are in school. For advanced education she has high schools, colleges, technical schools, and universities in large numbers. They told me in Tokyo that that city alone has sixty thousand students in its higher institutions of learning.

Four years ago, when Dr. Charles W. Eliot, President emeritus of Harvard University, returned home from the Orient after studying the educational systems there, he told us that Japan not only spends a larger proportion of her public money for education than we do, but has attained a higher standard of education than ours.

As to newspapers and periodicals, Japan is full of these. The traveller sees them everywhere. Tokyo, with a population of two million, has 761 newspapers and magazines, besides thirty-eight

news agencies. There are newspapers which have a daily circulation of a quarter of a million copies. A Methodist missionary, a doctor of divinity, the presiding elder of his district, said to me, "All my people, even the poorest and humblest, read the papers. My servants know more about what is going on in the world than I do."

Nor do the people confine their reading to newspapers and periodicals; they are great readers of books, and solid books, books of value, not merely ephemeral novels. It is amazing what numbers of the best books of Germany, France, Russia, Italy, England, and America one finds translated into Japanese. Every public library and every book store is rich in them. Equally surprising is the number of new books by Japanese authors, in every department of thought and knowledge, that one finds issuing from the press of Japan.

Do these facts throw no light upon the question of whether or not Japanese civilization is worthy to be compared with that of the West?

In free countries like our own, political freedom is regarded as a mark of high civilization.

Japan has political freedom and a constitutional and representative government. Freedom of

speech and of the press is essentially as perfect there as here, or as it has ever been in England.

Probably all of us would agree that the progress of science is one of the tests of civilization in our modern world. Of course Japan has done nothing like so much as a number of the countries of the West in original scientific research. This is because she has been so short a time in the field. But her interest in science is as keen as our own, and she is giving as much attention to it in her high schools, colleges, and universities as we are. Her students who have come for study to this country, Great Britain, France, and Germany, have taken up with enthusiasm every branch of science, and carried back their knowledge to Japan, to make use of it everywhere as teachers in institutions of learning and in all kinds of practical ways. And, brief as has been the period of Japan's scientific training, she already possesses many investigators who are making valuable original researches in numerous important scientific fields.

We may well think of art as a mark of civilization.

Japan is pre-eminently a land of art. Art and beauty are a part of the very life of the Japanese

people, all the people, even the poorest and humblest, to an extent that we of the West can only imperfectly understand.

It seems to be a common impression in this country that the Japanese are a nation of materialists. It would probably be much nearer the truth to call them a nation of idealists. This characteristic of their nature comes out in many ways. It appears in the universal fondness for poetry, and in the fact that nearly everyone writes poetry, from the Emperor and Empress down to the humblest day labourer. But perhaps the clearest indication is seen in art. It is doubtful whether among any other people in the world the art instinct, the art feeling, love for beauty and the constant enjoyment of beauty, is so universal as among the people of Japan.

Japanese drawing and painting are conspicuously idealistic, not realistic. No one can understand these two arts as developed in Japan unless he constantly bears this in mind. The painter does not seek to copy nature but to express the spirit of nature. Great numbers of Japanese paintings, even those of the best artists, fail from a scientific point of view, being inexact in size and perspective. The painter has not aimed at

exactness; to do that would be merely mechanical; he has aimed at something higher, subtler, deeper, namely, to express the spirit or spiritual significance of the scene or object represented. Japanese pictures are impressions; they lead the mind to inner meanings. An artist who draws a horse or a bird with a few flourishes of his brush (as the great artists of Japan do) cannot be a realist. His thought is of mystical significances, symbolic suggestions; these he wishes to flash on the imagination. Thus Japanese art can be truly appreciated by none but idealists. As soon as we understand this we are able to see that in drawing, but especially in painting, Japan has made a distinct contribution to the world's art wealth. Her painting is very different from that of Europe, but it is worthy to stand beside it.

In sculpture Japan has achieved little, as compared with ancient Greece or modern Italy. And yet she has some examples which as works of art are nearly or quite of the first rank, as, for instance, her colossal Kamakura Daibutsu, or Image of Buddha in bronze; the great Daibutsu in the Todai-ji temple in Nara, which dates from the eighth century, and her famous statue of Buddha in Michinaga's temple of Hasho-ji,

carved in wood by the artist Jocho in the eleventh century.

Japanese artists excel in fine carving, both in wood and in other materials. In the temples are to be found some of the most elaborate and exquisite wood carving of the world. Japanese coral carving also is attracting attention, on account of its great delicacy and excellence. It is believed that in a few years the industry of carving coral, which in the past has been almost wholly confined to Italy, will pass to Japan, and that in the future the world will look chiefly to the skilled workmen of the Empire of the Rising Sun for its supply of this delicate art work.

From very early times Japanese artists have excelled in decoration work in the form of inlaying with gold and silver. Nor has this ancient skill disappeared in modern times. The inlaid work produced in Japan today is of the very highest order.

In fine pottery, and all forms of ceramics, in lacquer work, and in the textile arts, Japan ranks high.

It is doubtful if any nation surpasses Japan in the art of landscape gardening.

In architecture Japan ranks distinctly below

Europe. It is true that she possesses many buildings that are very beautiful as well as wholly unique, particularly her temples. And yet she has nothing that we can justly class with the temples of ancient Greece, or with the medieval and modern Gothic architecture, particularly the cathedrals of France and England.

In Japan, to an extent found almost nowhere else in the world, art is an intimate and private rather than a distant and public matter. Perhaps among no other people does it do so much for the home, or for the inspiration of daily life. Writes Mr. G. Lowes Dickinson, in describing his observations and experiences in the Orient:

There is nothing in the West to compare with the homes, the living-rooms of Japan. Until I saw them I had no idea how exquisite human life could be made. The Japanese, as is well known, have discovered the secret of simplicity. Their rooms consist of a floor of spotless matting, paper walls, and a wooden roof. But the pictures on the paper walls, in these old palatial rooms, are masterpieces of great artists. From a background of gold leaf emerge and fade away suggestions of river and coast and hill, of peonies, chrysanthemums, lotuses, of wild geese and swans, of reeds and pools, of all that is elusive and choice in nature; decorations that are also lyric poems, hints of landscape that yet never pretend to

be a substitute for the real thing. The real thing is outside, and perhaps it will not intrude; for where we should have glass windows the Japanese have white paper screens. But draw back, if you choose, one of these screens, and you will see a little landscape garden, a little lake, a little bridge, a tiny rockery, a few gold-fish, a cluster of irises, a bed of lotus, and, above and beyond, the great woods. In apartments, all the cost, it will be seen, is lavished on the works of art. The principle is the same in the royal palace and in the humblest home. People who could so devise life, we may be sure, are people with a fineness of perception unknown to the West, unless it were once in ancient Greece. The Japanese, indeed, I suspect, are the Greeks of the East.

The same thought was curiously borne in upon me in the theatre at Kyoto. I have never seen anything so like what a Greek play may have been as I found here. I have never seen an art of such reserve and distinction. These actors, I felt, were the only ones that could act Greek drama.

Such is the judgment of a distinguished and eminently fair-minded Englishman regarding the art instincts and achievements of the Japanese.

Turning to the practical arts and industries, what do we find?

In navigation Japan ranks well with Great Britain, Germany, Norway, and the United States. In her shipyards she is building ships, both battle-

ships and ocean liners, about equal to any in the world. I have never ridden on steamers more perfect in all their appointments and in their management than some of the Japanese steamships on the Pacific.

In agriculture Japan is far advanced, perhaps about as far as is possible without the aid of agricultural machinery. Such machinery is being introduced to some extent, but the very small holdings of each farmer necessarily limits its availability. Scientific agriculture is taught extensively. There are in the Empire two university colleges of agriculture, five higher agricultural schools, and about two hundred agricultural, horticultural, and sericultural schools of middle and lower grade. The graduates of these schools are found in all parts of the country and are everywhere promoters of a new agriculture.

Although the natural fertility of the soil of Japan is not greater than our own, each Japanese acre yields on an average as much as three or four acres in America. That is the reason why she is able to feed her fifty-five million people from her very limited area of arable land. If we cultivated all our soil as well as Japan does hers, the United States could easily feed the entire population of the world.

In forestry Japan is well advanced. She is carrying on an astonishing amount of afforestation, especially on her mountainsides. We in America may well take example of her.

Japan has good railroads, though not equal to our own. Unfortunately they are narrow gauge, which she regrets, and is now engaged in the difficult and expensive task of changing.

Her mail service is well managed and efficient. Her telegraph service is good. Telephones are being extensively introduced.

Sanitation, cleanliness, and provision for the health of the people are marks of civilization.

Japan has excellent sanitary laws and they are very strictly enforced. Probably there are no cleaner people in the world than the Japanese, whether as regards their homes or their own persons. In the city of Tokyo there are 1100 public baths, in which it is calculated that at least five hundred thousand persons bathe daily. In every respectable private house there is a bathroom. Practically every person takes a full bath once a day. Many more than once. This is true of the lowest class. Hot baths are widely used.

Japan has been at great pains and expense to introduce the best medical science and the best

medical practice of the West. Besides encouraging her young men to study medicine in the best medical schools of America, France, and Germany, she has established medical schools of her own, equipped them with good laboratories, and manned them with able professors from the West, particularly from Germany.

With such medical service, of course she has excellent hospitals. Her medical, surgical, sanitary, and hospital services in her army and navy are equal to any in the world. Their excellence in connection with the war between Japan and Russia was so conspicuous as to attract the attention and win the admiration of every western nation.

CHAPTER III

JAPANESE CIVILIZATION (Continued)

The Civilization of Japan Compared with that of Europe and America

TEMPERANCE is a mark of civilization.

The Japanese people are more temperate than we are, and much more temperate than are the people of Great Britain or Germany.

Absence of crime is a mark of civilization. What about crime in Japan?

Practically all forms of criminality found in other civilized lands are found there. The most common are theft, fraud, forgery, gambling, and embezzlement. There are also vote-buying, dishonest corporations, and even "sugar frauds." And yet we of the West cannot throw stones. Statistics show that the general rate of criminality in Japan is lower than in the United States and lower than in most of the nations of Europe. As to crimes of violence it is distinctly lower. The

annual number of homicides (murders and suicides) in the United States is one to every 9500 of the population. In Japan it is only one in 53,000, or, in proportion to population, less than one fifth as many.

Japan has nothing in the way of criminality or brutality that is nearly so bad as our horrible lynchings.

Sex morality has been declared to be low in Japan.

It is true that it is much lower than it ought to be; but it is not so low as in some Christian lands. For example, if we compare Japan with Russia we find the comparison to be decidedly favourable to Japan. In both countries women of bad character are registered. The books of the police show that, before the war, in 1912, while there were 50,000 such women in Petrograd alone, there were only 43,000 in the whole Japanese Empire. If we compare Petrograd and Tokyo, the two capitals, with one another, we find that, Petrograd, with a population less than 2,000,000, contained 50,000 dissolute women, and Tokyo, with a population of over 2,000,000, contained only 6500, or about one seventh as many in proportion to population. Carrying our comparison to coun-

tries outside of Russia, according to the best statistics I have been able to obtain, the number of evil women in the large cities of Japan generally is not more than one third or one fourth as great in proportion to the population as in most of the largest cities of Europe and the United States.

Says a writer of high standing, now living in New York, but who knows Japan well from many years' residence there: "As long as the white-slave trade in our midst is so horrible, as has been revealed by the vice commissions of New York and Chicago, we had better refrain from making the Japanese a target of criticism."

Perhaps there is no higher American authority on Japan than Dr. Sidney L. Gulick. Says Dr. Gulick: "No one can deny that the shameless immoralities to be found in New York, Chicago, London, Paris, and Berlin surpass anything seen in Japan."¹

If we inquire regarding illegitimate births, we find that at least six of the countries of Europe have a higher rate of illegitimacy than Japan. In the year 1912 the number of illegitimate births in Japan was only 93 per 10,000; but in Italy it was 98, in Belgium 111, in Sweden 125, in

¹ *The White Peril in the Far East*, p. 40.

Denmark, 133, in Hungary, 151. In Austria it was 230, or nearly two and a half times as many in proportion to population as among the Japanese.¹

The number of divorces in Japan is greater in proportion to the population than in most of the countries of Europe, and also than in most (but not all) of the States of the American Union. Of course, this is to be deplored. It should be said, however, that the frequency of divorce does not grow so much out of immorality on the part of either husband or wife, as from the custom long prevalent in Japan (but now being rapidly changed) of young husbands bringing their brides to live in the homes of the husbands' parents. The dominance of mothers-in-law over the wives of their sons is a fruitful breeder of trouble between wives and husbands, which only too often leads to separation. Now that the custom is growing, of newly married couples at once establishing homes of their own, it is believed that divorces will become less frequent.

One of the tests of a high civilization undoubtedly is that of honesty, personal honesty and

¹ Geo. Kennan, in *The Outlook* of August 31, 1912, pp. 1014-1015.

integrity in business and in the affairs of life generally. Does Japan stand this test?

Reports have been circulated in this country by her enemies, and perhaps by others, to the effect that she does not. Disparaging comparisons are made between Japan and China, and we are told that whereas in China merchants, traders, and the people generally can be trusted, in Japan the grounds for trust are much less secure. Many times I have been asked whether I do not think this is so.

My answer is: Probably it may have been true fifty or sixty years ago, when Americans first came into business relations with Japan, that there was a difference of this nature between the merchants and traders of the two nations. Business honesty in the past has been high in China. In Japan business honesty and honour were not so high formerly as they are now. Outside of business the Japanese maintained standards of honour that were unsurpassed; but they do not seem to have carried them into trade as fully as did the Chinese. The reason is easy to find.

For ages (during all the centuries of Feudalism) the trading class was ranked in Japan as socially low, lower than the agriculturists and much lower

than the *samurai*. The result of this low estimate in which trade (the whole business of mere money-making) was held, was that the moral standards of the trading class, the money-making class, sank to a lower level than those found among other classes of the people. This continued until the New Age of Japan; then a change took place. The men who first came from Japan to America and Europe to study western civilization returned to tell their people that Japan's future prosperity and success must be found largely in commerce and trade with the nations of the West. But in order to meet the conditions of this trade and commerce their standards of business honesty and honour must be as high as those of the West. This raised the question: How could such standards be secured and maintained? At once it was seen that the obstacle in the way was largely social. There must be a change of social ideals. The men engaged in commerce and trade, in business and in finance, must no longer be looked down upon socially. These occupations must not be left to the least respected class in society. The very best men of the nation, the ablest and the most respected, must take them up.

The result was, a change of this kind was en-

tered upon. Encouraged by the government, men of the highest character and social standing began more and more turning their attention to all lines of business and finance. There seems reason to believe that today the financiers of Japan and the men carrying on her larger industries and commercial operations are of as high a type as can be found anywhere in the business or financial world.

In this connection it seems important to call attention to a mischievous story which has been extensively and persistently circulated in this country, and perhaps others, to the effect that all Japanese banks have Chinese cashiers and managers because Japanese men sufficiently honest and trustworthy cannot be found to fill these responsible positions. Having myself repeatedly met this statement, I supposed for a long time that it was true. But what are the facts?

The story is absolutely false. Its falsity has been set forth again and again and from sources of the most unquestionable reliability—among others by Mr. George Kennan, in *The Outlook*, by Professor Francis G. Peabody in *The North American Review*, by several missionaries, and by various Japanese authorities of the highest standing.

Yet the falsehood persists. The truth in the case is, there are upwards of 2300 Japanese banks in Japan, and not one of them employs a Chinese cashier or general manager. Says Mr. K. K. Kawakami in his volume *Asia at the Door*: "In all my life I have never heard a lie so unblushing as this. . . . There is no Japanese bank that employs a single Chinese in any capacity."

Possibly the basis or starting point of this widespread and harmful fiction may be found in the following fact. There are in the Orient three or four *international* banks, such as the Hongkong Shanghai Bank and the Charter Bank of India, which were first established in China, and which later opened branches in Japan (in Yokohama and Kobe), primarily for the purpose of transacting business between Japan and China, and secondarily to transact international business generally. Of course in these three or four banks (which are not strictly Japanese, and which, coming from China, have a large business to transact with China, a country whose currency is multifarious and exceedingly difficult to understand), it is natural and almost necessary that Chinese cashiers and bookkeepers should be employed. This deceives not a few American travellers who happen

to have provided themselves with letters of credit to these particular banks because of their international character. Going to these banks and receiving their money from Chinese cashiers they leap to the conclusion, and spread the report, that all the other 2300 banks in Japan (all of Japan's own banks, as well as these three or four semi-foreign ones) employ cashiers from China, which, as already said, is not true in a single case.

However high Chinese standards of business honesty or business efficiency may be, Japan finds no need to go to China or anywhere else outside of her own borders to find plenty of men of ability and of the most unquestionable integrity, to carry on all her banks, and also her other lines of important business activity. One wonders how long this stupid falsehood about the Chinese cashiers, so often exposed, will continue to be circulated in America, to the cruel injury of Japan.¹

But even if we grant that Japanese bankers and men conducting business on a large scale and the higher class of Japanese people generally have

¹ A somewhat full statement of the facts bearing on this subject may be found in *The Japanese Nation*, by Prof. Inazo Nitobé, pp. 169-173. See also *Asia at the Door*, by K. K. Kawakami, pp. 51-52.

standards of honour and honesty comparable with those of the West, is it not true that the great mass of the Japanese people are less honest and trustworthy than the common people of Christian lands? Statements to this effect are often made by enemies, and sometimes by persons claiming to be friends of Japan. Are they true? Much investigation, made in many directions, has failed to convince me that they are.

Of many similar testimonials I will cite one or two. A Methodist Doctor of Divinity, who is the Presiding Elder of a large missionary district in Japan, who has lived in the country more than forty years and has had a very wide experience among the people, both inside his own churches and outside, explicitly denied to me that there was any just ground for statements of this kind, and declared that in his judgment the common people of Japan—artisans, gardeners, farmers, common labourers, and others—are as honest and trustworthy as the same classes of people in any country. Comparing servants in Japan with servants in America, he affirmed that he had found greater faithfulness and trustworthiness in the Japanese. In his home in Japan his family had never found it necessary to protect themselves

against their servants by putting valuables under lock and key. Only under exceptional circumstances did they even lock the doors of their homes at night. "Both my experience and my observation," he declared, "justify the assertion that if you treat the Japanese people fairly, they very rarely disappoint you, or fail to manifest the most scrupulous honesty and honour in their dealings with you."

An American friend who has lived in Japan twenty-five years, with whom I did much travelling, said to me: "You need have no anxiety here about your baggage. If you were travelling or staying at a hotel in Europe you would have to keep a sharp lookout all the while or something would be lost or stolen or in some way go astray. But in Japan all you need to do is to commit everything you have, even a dozen pieces, to your servant or porter, and at the end of your journey or the end of the day, or whenever you want them, every piece will be there." "I trust my jinrikisha man," he continued, "my coachman, my hotel porter or room boy, my personal servant, to a degree that would be entirely unsafe in the West, and I am almost never disappointed."

The two following stories came to my know-

ledge while I was in Japan. They are very simple, but are worth noticing as throwing light upon the honesty of the common people.

The first story was of an American lady residing in one of the Japanese cities who was returning home from her summer vacation in the mountains. When the train stopped at a small station (Isobe by name) she put her head out of the car window and bought a package of cakes of a boy who was vending his wares on the platform. The price of the cakes was fifteen *sen*, but not being able to make the change she gave him twenty. He was so busy making other sales that before he could return the five *sen*, due her, the train started. Of course she thought she would never see her money; but it was a small matter and was quickly forgotten. What was her surprise, as the train stopped at the next station, to hear a boy calling out at the top of his voice: "Where is the lady to whom the cake seller in Isobe owes five *sen*?" She told him that she was the person, and received her change. The young Isobe cake vendor had telephoned down the line to a friend in this place requesting him to be sure to go to the train, find the lady, and pay her the money which was her due.

The other story was as simple and as interesting. It was told by an American missionary lady living in the interior. She said that when she goes to market and orders a chicken to be delivered the following day or the day after, the boy who brings the chicken often brings with it an egg. The first time this happened she wanted the egg explained. Was it a present? No. But the egg had been laid after the lady purchased the hen, and therefore the seller insisted that it belonged to her.

On hearing these stories I involuntarily found myself querying: How many American boys who sell cakes at a railway station would take as much trouble as that Japanese boy at Isobe did, to get change to a woman whom they never expected to see again? And how many American poultry boys would be so scrupulously honest as to insist that their customer was the rightful owner of the egg which his hen had laid between the time it was bought and the time it was delivered?

Of course these particular boys may have been exceptional in their honesty; indeed I am quite prepared to admit that probably they were; for the Japanese people, like ourselves, are very human. Of course, too, the incidents are very

trifling. And yet they are not without significance as throwing a little light upon the question of the honesty of the common people of Japan.

The stories made me wonder whether there was any connection between the honesty of these boys and the moral instruction which they receive in their schools. In Japan moral training is given to the extent of at least two hours a week, in all schools controlled by the government, that is in all schools except a comparatively small number which are in private hands.

A Japanese educator who had been visiting the schools of Boston said to Edward Everett Hale: "We do not devote so much attention to arithmetic in our schools in Japan as you do in America." "What takes the place of arithmetic?" inquired Dr. Hale. The Japanese gentleman replied: "We teach our children history and morals. We think arithmetic tends to make them sordid."

In the year 1890 the Emperor issued what is known as the "Imperial Decree on Education and Morals," which is required to be taught as an essential in the instruction of all Japanese youth. What may perhaps be regarded as the most essential part of the Rescript consists of the following precepts:

Be filial to your parents.

Be affectionate to your brothers.

Be harmonious as husbands and wives and faithful as friends.

Conduct yourself with propriety and carefulness.

Extend generosity and benevolence to your neighbours.

Attend to your studies faithfully and practise diligently your respective callings.

Cultivate your intellects and elevate your morals.

Advance public benefits and promote the general social welfare.

Always render strict obedience to the constitution and laws of the land.

Display personal courage and public spirit in the interest of your country whenever required.

What nation of Europe or America teaches in its schools a better or a more practical system of morals than this?

If any of us have thought of the Japanese people as caring only for material things and not also for the ideal and the moral, we must revise our judgment. I have already said that in the Japanese nature there is a large ideal element. This idealism appears most clearly, perhaps, in their art; but it also manifests itself in education, in literature, and in many other ways. The following incident is suggestive of what I mean. I

found in the High Commercial College of Tokyo a class of two hundred young men studying Emerson, the one great thinker and writer of the modern world in whom the ideal and the moral (the ethical) are perhaps most richly developed. Of course this study was of their own choice. Baron Kanda, the Principal of the College, who was their teacher and leader, told me that he had no class in which there was more enthusiasm.

A distinguished Japanese when he heard of the death of Lafcadio Hearn, said: "We could better have lost two or three battleships."

CHAPTER IV

JAPANESE CIVILIZATION (Concluded)

The Civilization of Japan Compared with that of Europe and America

ONE test of the civilization of a nation doubtless is the way it carries on war—the way it treats prisoners of war, and its obedience or disobedience to the established laws of war, and indeed to all international law.

How does Japan stand this test?

I think I am quite within the bounds of moderation when I say that she appears to stand it as well as any modern nation.

In the joint military expedition sent to Peking by Great Britain, Germany, France, Russia, Japan, and the United States, during the Boxer uprising in China, to rescue the imperilled legations, we are told, upon what seems to be the best of authority, that while the soldiers of most of the other nations engaged extensively in looting,

and committed serious depredations and cruelties upon the Chinese people, the Japanese contingent (as also the American) refrained absolutely from everything of the kind, and conducted itself in every respect in accordance with the most honourable laws of war.

In the war between Japan and Russia, Japan set a new standard of morality and honour for modern armies, in the conduct of her soldiers, in her dealings with her enemies, and especially in her treatment of her prisoners. To their amazement the Russian prisoners found themselves everywhere treated with the utmost courtesy and kindness, and fed and housed as well, and treated medically and surgically with as great care, as the Japanese soldiers themselves. All reports coming from the armies in the field agreed that while in the Russian army, among both officers and men, there existed loose military discipline, much intemperance, much gambling, much debauchery, and very little effective sanitation, among the Japanese there was strict military discipline, careful sanitation, universal temperance, and general moral conduct of a high order.

An American missionary who was present in

Japan during the war with Russia¹ has given the following testimony as to the remarkable absence of hatred manifested by the Japanese toward the Russian people. Writing on this subject he says:

If there had been any real hatred in the hearts of the Japanese people toward the Russians it certainly would have manifested itself. And yet not once did I hear of anything to indicate such a hatred. On the contrary, I often heard expressions of sympathy for the common people of Russia and expressions of hope that the war might result in good to Russia as a whole. When Makárov, the Russian admiral, went down with his flagship I was unable to detect a single note of exultation, but I observed many evidences of sympathy for the loss of so brave and able a commander and so valuable a ship.

A similar absence of rancour, and a similar feeling of chivalry and kindliness have been manifest from the beginning of the present war with Germany. When diplomatic relations between Japan and Germany were severed, a general order was issued by the Japanese government at once, and universally promulgated, pointing out that there should be no feeling of enmity toward any German individually, commanding that the greatest pos-

¹ Rev. I. W. Cate of the Universalist Mission.

sible care should be taken everywhere to give full and perfect protection to all subjects of Germany sojourning within the Japanese Empire, even going so far as to direct that vigilance be taken to supervise the conduct of students and school children to the end that they might not be led away by excessive or false feelings of patriotism to be discourteous, or "to behave themselves toward the subjects of the belligerent power in any way not creditable to the high character of the Japanese people."

In the military operations of Japan against the German stronghold in Kiao-Chau, China, while the Japanese army fought hard so long as there was fighting to be done, as soon as the city surrendered, every possible courtesy was shown to the Germans, to lessen the humiliation of their defeat and to promote their physical comfort.

If the fine example set by Japan in these respects has been followed by the European nations in the war of 1914, how different would have been the terrible record!

Love of peace is a mark of true civilization. Has Japan this mark?

Contrary to an impression widespread in this country, which has been created and persistently

disseminated by our jingoes and by other enemies of Japan, the Japanese people are and for centuries have been eminently peaceful in their ideals and their national life.

It is true that they have done considerable fighting during the past twenty-five years; but it has all been, as they have believed, directly or indirectly in self-defence. Indeed, Japan's principal war, that with Russia in 1904-1905, was one which she felt herself compelled to wage in order to preserve her very existence. But as to her previous record, she has been beyond question, for a long period, one of the most peaceful, perhaps the most peaceful, nation in the entire world. For more than 250 years, while we in the United States had fought four wars, besides all our wars with the Indians, and while the nations of Europe had carried on conflicts almost innumerable, some of them on a vast scale and of the most sanguinary character, Japan had fought no war, but had remained absolutely at peace at home and abroad; and for a much longer time—a period of nearly 1300 years—she had had only one war with a foreign people. In justice it should be said that this freedom from foreign wars was probably partly due to her isolation. And yet,

taking that into full consideration, her peace record is remarkable.

To be sure, before her long era of home peace began Japan had passed through an age of turbulence, somewhat similar to the Feudal Age in Europe, and during that period there was much petty strife and bloodshed among her barons and her chiefs, as was the case in most of the European countries. But that period ended in Japan three centuries ago, and since that time, as has just been intimated, she has had a record of peace, both at home and abroad, which is actually superior to that of any nation of the western world.

It is one of the strange anomalies of a civilization calling itself Christian that the professedly Christian nations of the West virtually compelled Japan to create for herself a strong army and navy and to show herself formidable as a military power before they would consent to grant her equal international rights with themselves, or admit her to fellowship as a first-class nation. Her education, her art, her industries, the intelligence of her people, her civilization older than that of many of the nations of Europe, did not avail: she had to show that she could fight; then but not before

they were willing to treat her with justice and to give her a place by their side.

Said Count Hayashi, the distinguished Japanese statesman, at the time of the Russo-Japanese War:

Today we Japanese have battleships, torpedoes, cannon. The China seas redden with the blood of our own killed and of those whom we kill. Our torpedoes roar, our shrapnel shriek, and we die and are the cause of death. And you occidentals say to us: "Now you have won your rank; you have civilized yourselves." Centuries upon centuries we have had artists, painters, sculptors, philosophers, literature. Were we then barbarians?

We Americans call ourselves a peaceful people, and point to Japan as warlike. But let us look at this fact. In the years before the European War began, while we were at peace with all the world and when no hostilities threatened us from any quarter, we were expending sixty-seven per cent. of our large national income on wars past or future. What of Japan? At the same time her total expenditure for war purposes was only thirty-seven per cent. of her relatively small national income.

We call ourselves peaceful and the people of Japan warlike. But who invented the machine

gun? Who invented armoured ships? Who invented the submarine? Who invented the aeroplane, and called the attention of the world to it as a new instrument for human destruction? Not Japan, but America. We invented every one of these horrible engines of death that are making war a new terror on the earth. Then why do we not point to ourselves rather than to Japan, as warlike?

After Commodore Perry had caused the opening of the Japanese ports, when the people of Japan were learning for the first time about the great Christian world of the West, they were shocked to find out how many savage wars we carry on. They wondered whether they could not do something to help us become more peaceful. A distinguished Japanese patriot and ethical teacher, Yokoi Shonan by name, actually begged his government to send him to the western nations as an ambassador of peace to plead with them to end their bloody conflicts. "These Christian nations of the West," he said, "have constantly been fighting brutal and bloody wars. Let us go there and teach them how great are the blessings of peace."

Japan's love for peace is not confined to the

past. There is the strongest evidence that it is active today. A little while before the breaking out of the European War the Carnegie Peace Foundation of this country sent Dr. Charles W. Eliot of Harvard University and Dr. David Starr Jordan of Leland Stanford University, as its representatives to Japan and other countries of the Orient to speak upon the subject of peace. Following a little after these gentlemen, as I did, I was amused as well as interested to hear the comments that were spoken in not a few Japanese circles regarding their mission. Everyone referred to them with great respect, regarding it as an honour to their nation to be visited by men of such high character and distinction. But why, the question was asked again and again, did Americans think it important to send peace advocates to Japan? Japan was already in sympathy with peace aims, and ready to do everything in her power to assist in organizing the world for the promotion of peace. Indeed nothing did she so much desire as peace, except justice and honour. The countries where peace advocacy was needed, it was declared, were America and Europe.

I think I may venture to mention magnanimity as a mark of a noble civilization.

There are many evidences of the magnanimity of the Japanese people. We Americans have had many illustrations of it in our dealings with them. I will cite two.

Notwithstanding all the indignities which the State and people of California have heaped upon the Japanese, when in the year 1906 San Francisco suffered its great double calamity of earthquake and fire, the people of Japan sent one hundred thousand dollars to aid her sufferers.

When I was in Japan in the autumn of 1913 I found the public there widely discussing the question whether the government ought to accept the invitation which it had received to make an exhibit at the Panama Exposition in San Francisco a year or two later. Some said: "No! After the treatment which our people have been subjected to in California, we cannot; we must retaliate; we must refuse to have anything to do with the Exposition until our wrongs are righted." This, however, was not the spirit which I found to be uppermost. The more influential part of the people and also the government said: "We will not stoop to retaliation. The United States is a friendly power. The American people as a whole have not injured us. Only a part of the people

of California have been unfair to us. Let us act as if we had suffered no wrong." As a result what did we see? The Japanese government rose quite above all thoughts of retaliation or resentment, and, at a large expense, furnished one of the finest if not the very finest foreign exhibit in the entire Exposition.

In these two incidents we get a glimpse of the deeper Japan, the truer Japan—the Japan which some of us so strangely misunderstand, and, in our ignorance, distrust and misrepresent.

Judged of by one test Japanese civilization seems to us of the West not to be high. That test is the status of woman.

To us the lives of the women of Japan seem limited, circumscribed, subordinated to the will and the interests of the male members of their families, to too great a degree to be conducive to the highest welfare of either the home or the nation. In this respect she seems to us to occupy a place clearly below that of the United States, and below that of several of the more advanced nations of Europe.

However, it should be noted that a change for the better has begun and is going forward steadily and even rapidly. Japan has established universal

elementary education for her girls as well as for her boys. Provision for advanced education for girls and young women is rapidly increasing. In Tokyo I found a well-equipped Woman's University with fifteen hundred students. And I was informed that the universities established for young men are beginning to open their doors to young women.

In several other directions also besides education women are finding a larger life. A Japanese vernacular paper in a recent issue gives a list of sixty-four occupations now open to women, which were formerly confined to men. The Imperial Railway Bureau employs nearly four thousand women as ticket sellers, cashiers, and bookkeepers. The Bank of Japan has 120 women employees. Women typists are numerous. Probably some of the new occupations which women are entering are not wholly a boon. Great numbers of women and girls are now employed in factories, in some of which the hours are too long, the wages too low, and the health conditions are far from good. However, we should remember that factory life in Japan is new. Probably its conditions are not worse than were those of this country and England when factory life began with us. We have

made great improvements as time has gone on, although our factory laws and factory conditions are still far from perfect. Encouraging improvements are going forward in Japan. We must give her time.

There are now in Japan women artists, novelists, journalists, poets, musicians, actors, doctors. The women physicians mostly serve in hospitals, but some are carrying on their profession independently and with success. Women teachers are fast increasing in numbers. There are good normal colleges for their training, and nearly half the primary schools of the nation are now in their charge.

I think it may truthfully be said that both the intellectual and the social life of woman in Japan are being steadily elevated. She is coming to be given a position in all respects more nearly equal to that of man. More and more she is being made man's real companion. Japan's contact with the West, especially with America, seems to have done much to give the nation a new ideal for woman. There are unmistakable signs that a better day is coming for Japanese womanhood.

A good test of civilization is philanthropy, interest in movements for the unselfish aid of those who are in need.

Perhaps there is no finer philanthropy in our time than the Red Cross. How stand Japan and the United States as related to this movement? Although the Red Cross was introduced into Japan much later than into this country, its growth proceeded much more rapidly there than here. On the 1st of March, 1917, the United States had only three hundred thousand Red Cross members, while Japan had two million, with a yearly income of approximately three million dollars.¹

I mention only one other mark of civilization. It is religious toleration. Where this is found civilization is likely to be high. What do we find to be the condition of things in Japan?

I think I am right in answering that nowhere in the world is there a higher degree of religious toleration than among the Japanese people. In Japan there is perfect freedom for all faiths. Christianity, a foreign religion, and comparatively a newcomer into the country, is given perfect equality before the law with the old long-established faiths of the land. This is remarkable.

If Buddhist and Shintoist missionaries from

¹ Since the date named the Red Cross of the United States has greatly increased its membership, as well as raised a very large sum of money for use in connection with the war in Europe.

Japan should come in numbers to this* country and establish churches and schools here, and should endeavour to induce our young people to leave our Christianity and accept their faiths, as our Christian missionaries go to Japan and establish churches and schools and try to induce the Buddhist and Shintoist young people of that country to forsake their religions and accept Christianity, does any one think that we would be as tolerant as the Japanese are? Does any one think we would treat those Buddhist and Shintoist missionaries with as much consideration as the Japanese treat our missionaries? Japan not only allows Christian missionaries from foreign lands to organize and carry on churches and schools in perfect freedom, but she permits those Christian organizations to hold property and to *enjoy exemption from taxation*. Think of this!

Two or three years ago the Mikado of Japan made a present of twenty-five thousand dollars to an Episcopalian hospital in Tokyo. Would the President of the United States or the King of England or the Emperor of Germany be likely to make a present of twenty-five thousand dollars to a Buddhist hospital if one were established in either of these countries?

Several years ago in a time of serious political disturbance in Tokyo a riotous mob damaged many buildings, among them several Christian churches. What followed? Leading Buddhists of that city came forward and offered to pay two thirds of the cost of repairing these damaged Christian churches.

I am afraid Japan much surpasses us in religious toleration, generosity, and charity.

In these comparisons which I am making between the civilization of Japan and that of the Christian nations of the West, my aim is not to hold up Japan as a paragon of perfection, or her people as exhibiting no intellectual or moral limitations. Very far from that. Japanese civilization, like our own, is far from perfect. The Japanese people are not all angels, by any means; but certainly they are not all devils. They have many limitations, some of them very serious. But of what nation may not the same be said? We all easily see the faults of our neighbours. Nations criticize other nations much more severely than themselves. Race antipathies abound. Especially is it true that the "white" race is likely to look down upon other races without much sympathy and therefore without much

understanding—judging of them often very superficially, very ignorantly, and very cruelly.

What I am trying to do is simply to aid a little, if I may, in causing the people of this country to lay aside their national, racial, and religious prejudices, and to judge of this rising and important neighbour nation of ours on the other side of the Pacific, fairly and justly, that is, by the same standards that we employ in judging our neighbour nations on the other side of the Atlantic, and that we want other nations to employ in judging us.

CHAPTER V

THE MENACE OF A JAPANESE INVASION OF AMERICA

How the Idea Arose

WHY has any such thought ever come into anybody's mind as that there is, or ever has been, or within any discernible future ever will be, danger of the United States being invaded or attacked by Japan?

Do we not know that Japan has far more reason to talk of peril from us than we of peril from her? I do not mean that either nation has any just ground for suspecting the other; but, as between the two, I think it ought to be recognized and confessed that we have done and said more things that seem capable of being interpreted as hostile or threatening than has Japan. Let me make clear what I mean.

So far as I have been able to discover, no one has ever been able to point out one single case showing any thought on the part of the Japanese

government of invading this country, or any hostile intent against us, or any desire to encroach on our rights. Absolutely every case of seeming hostility or seeming intention to attack us that has been paraded before the public has either been based on misunderstanding, or else it has been a pure fake, invented by enemies of Japan, or by German or other parties desiring to embroil us with Japan. Of this point I shall speak more fully later on.

But while no man can put his finger upon anything in the conduct of the Japanese government which furnishes ground for our fearing Japan, there have been some things done by our government and many done by our people which have seemed to the Japanese to furnish real grounds for apprehension on their part that we may be cherishing hostile designs against them.

In the first place, in all our growth as a nation, we have been more and more extending our territory toward and on the Pacific Ocean. We began our national career on the Atlantic seaboard. All our original thirteen States were there. By the Ordinance of 1787 new States were created extending as far west as the Mississippi, or about one third of the way across the continent. In

1803 the Louisiana Purchase was made, extending our territory more than two thirds of the distance to the Pacific. In 1846 by the settlement of the Oregon question we obtained a large area of territory on the Pacific. In 1848 this area was greatly enlarged by our compelling Mexico to cede to us the large territory now known as the State of California, which gave us a national frontage on the Pacific Ocean of more than one thousand miles.

This brought us face to face with Japan, she on one side of the Pacific and we on the other.

But we did not stop here in our push toward Asia. In 1867, we purchased from Russia the very large territory of Alaska, which added more than three thousand miles to our coast line on the Pacific, on Bering Sea, and on Bering Strait. This brought us to within thirty-six miles of the Asiatic continent. Furthermore, with Alaska we obtained the long chain of Aleutian Islands, which stretched out for a distance of twelve hundred miles from the Alaska coast in the general direction of Japan.

But even here we did not pause in our advance Asia-ward. In 1823 we had announced to the world what is known as our Monroe Doctrine, by which we let it be known that from that time

forward the United States could not consent to allow any European (or, presumably, any other foreign) power to plant colonies on either American continent. Of course the natural implication from this was that in return for our exclusion of foreign nations from American territory, we on our part would refrain from encroaching on foreign territory. But to this implication we have not been true. In 1898 we proceeded to annex to the United States the Hawaiian Islands, which are situated in the Pacific nearly halfway to Japan. In the same year also we wrested from Spain the island of Guam, far on toward the Philippines, and the Philippines themselves, a large and important island group only a little way from the Asiatic coast and near to Japan. Finally, in 1899, by an agreement with Great Britain and Germany, we obtained possession of the Tutuila group of the Samoa Islands, in the central southern Pacific.

Thus in a little more than a hundred years we had not only extended our territory from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and for thousands of miles along the Pacific coast almost to within sight of Asia, but we had also pushed our way almost across the Pacific Ocean itself, taking possession

of and fortifying islands of great strategic importance, some of them within a few hundred miles of Japan.

Is it any wonder if the Japanese people have seen all this with some apprehension?

Suppose that Japan had extended her territory toward us as we have extended our territory toward her. Suppose she had gradually, either by conquest or purchase, gained possession of the Asiatic coast north of her to Bering Strait, within thirty-six miles of America? Suppose she had pushed out over the Pacific Ocean, seizing and fortifying Guam and Hawaii, and a group of islands as large as the Philippines, that is, containing an area equal to the States of New York and Pennsylvania, situated as near to our coast as the Philippines are to her shores—would we be quite happy over the situation? Would we feel quite sure that we were safe, and that Japan had no sinister designs against us?

Surely these facts should help us to see that if there is cause for fear or distrust on either side, it is Japan that has cause to fear and distrust us, not we her.

For while we have been doing these things she has been doing nothing of the kind. She has

threatened us in no way. She has encroached upon our rights in no respect. While we have not confined ourselves to the Occident, she has confined herself strictly to the Orient. She has not seized or shown any sign of a desire to seize a foot of land in or near the United States or on the American continent.

In other ways, too, we have given her what have seemed to some of her people grounds for uneasiness.

We have long had a navy more than twice as strong as that of Japan.¹ Yet our military and naval men and their friends have been constantly urging further naval increase, and increase on the Pacific; and very large appropriations for such increase have actually been made at various times by Congress. What has all that meant? Is it strange if to many Japanese it has seemed to mean hostility to them? What other nation could we have in mind in constantly enlarging our fleet, when we were at peace with all the nations of Europe?

Unfortunately, too, this apprehension on their part has found what seemed abundant justification in a great flood of shallow but loud-voiced

¹ Proof of the truth of this statement will be given later.

talk, jingo talk, pugnacious talk, spread-eagle talk, that has been sweeping over this country for a dozen years about the Pacific being "our ocean," an "American ocean"; about our right and our need as a nation to be "supreme on the Pacific," to "dominate the Pacific," to make ourselves "masters of the Pacific," and all that kind of thing; as if other nations (Canada, Mexico, Colombia, Peru, Chile, Russia, Japan, China, and Australia) did not have in the aggregate a many times longer coast line on the Pacific than we do, and therefore a many times over greater right to "own" it; as if we or any of the nations on its shores had any more right or need to "own" or "dominate" it than Great Britain or France or Spain or Brazil or Argentina or any nation in the world had to "own" or "dominate" or "make itself master" of the Atlantic or any other ocean in the world!

It has to be confessed with humiliation that this kind of foolish, buncombe, irritating, incendiary talk has been indulged in by many men who ought to have known better, even by men inside of the walls of Congress. Why did they not stop to reflect how unjust and dishonourable it was; and how, reported in Japan, as of course

it would be, it could not but tend seriously to wound and alienate an honourable and friendly neighbour nation, whose friendship should be prized by every American?

CHAPTER VI

THE MENACE OF A JAPANESE INVASION OF AMERICA (Continued)

How the Idea Arose

I THINK there is not an intelligent man in this country who would ever have dreamed of an invasion from Japan had not the thought been conjured up and set afloat, on the one hand by enemies of Japan, and, on the other, by reckless jingoes and militarists among us who hoped that by creating a popular scare of this kind, they might secure increased appropriations for the navy.¹

¹ I do not care to mention the names of persons carrying on this war against Japan any further than to say that the two men who seem to have been more responsible for its inauguration than any others were Captain R. P. Hobson and "General" Homer Lea, in his book, *The Valour of Ignorance*. Mr. Lea was an adventurer who palmed himself off on the public as a military officer of large knowledge and high rank, on the basis of a fake claim of having rendered important military service in China. As many as a dozen or fifteen years ago Captain Hobson began

Such a vast organized campaign of persistent, many-sided hostility and misrepresentation carried on for years against any nation, as for a decade and more has been waged by certain men and interests in this country against Japan, seems wellnigh incredible. The misrepresentations of these foes of Japan and these alarmists have been exposed numberless times by men of the most unquestionable knowledge and of the highest

using the bogey of a "Japanese Peril" as a "big stick" which so long as he was in Congress he brandished with tireless vigour over the heads of his fellow Congressmen, and, so far as he could, over the heads of the American people, with the purpose of compelling them to do their duty and save the nation from impending destruction by building a big navy against Japan. The modest sum that he thought would be sufficient for that end was two and a half billion dollars. He named December, 1911, as the latest date on which Japan would begin war on us. The war he told us would last five years, and might last ten.

So much for the inception of our Japanese scare.

Three of the latest books on the subject, written in the spirit of Captain Hobson and "General" Lea, which paint everything Japanese "red," and which give us full information of the devilish plottings of Japan and the awful danger that hangs over our head like the sword of Damocles, are Mr. Carl Crow's *Japan and America*, Mr. Frederick McCormick's *The Menace of Japan* (1917), and Mr. Montaville Flowers' *The Japanese Conquest of American Opinion* (1917).

As proof that this miserable business of stirring up ill feeling toward Japan is not over, and is not likely soon to be over unless the American people arouse themselves to the peril of it, is seen by the fact that two of these incendiary books bear the date of the present year.

character, such as Dr. William Elliot Griffis, Dr. Sidney L. Gulick, Dr. John H. DeForest, Prof. H. A. Millis, Dr. Jesse F. Steiner, President J. A. B. Scherer, Prof. James F. Abbott, Dr. Hamilton W. Mabie, Dr. Hamilton Holt, Dr. David Starr Jordan, Dr. Doremus E. Scudder, Mr. George Kennan, Mr. Lindsay Russell, our American Ambassadors to Japan, almost the entire body of our American missionaries, and many Japanese writers of eminence and reliability. And yet the misrepresentations continue to be poured out upon the public in newspapers, magazines, and books. Says Dr. Griffis: "I find that seven tenths of the press articles in this country hostile to Japan are downright falsehoods. They are either gross exaggerations, or else pure misrepresentations and calumnies." Mr. George W. Guthrie, our late United States Ambassador to Japan, in an address delivered in Tokyo, February 22, 1917 (one of his last public utterances), took pains to point out the chief cause of all the suspicions and misunderstandings that exist between the United States and Japan as being "irresponsible utterances, sometimes malicious, of which mountains are made."

If there is any man in the United States that is

in a position to know the real facts as to the relations existing between this country and Japan, it is the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations in our national House of Representatives. The late David J. Foster, Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations in the House, whose death was so great a loss not only to his own country but to the cause of international peace and justice in the world, was quoted in the *New York Evening Post* of April 23, 1911, as saying:

I am absolutely convinced that there is a criminal conspiracy on foot for the purpose of bringing on a war between the United States and Japan. Thousands upon thousands of dollars are being spent to carry on this propaganda.

Probably the most influential religious body in this country, and the body most closely in touch with Japan and other foreign countries and most intelligent concerning our foreign relations generally, is the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. At its Quadrennial Meeting of 1916 this distinguished body passed unanimously the following resolution:

Whereas, Certain newspapers of the United States have published cartoons, displays, advertisements,

serial stories, and black-faced editorials highly insulting to Japan, and promoting among our people an attitude of suspicion, race prejudice, and animosity inimical to the maintenance of friendly relations: therefore

Resolved, That the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America hereby expresses its condemnation of this misuse of the press, and urges upon all editors, reporters, and publishers their incomparable opportunity in promoting good-will between ourselves and other nations, founded upon correct information, sympathetic understanding, and universal human brotherhood.

These scare-mongers have been at work ever since the Japanese-Russian War. The methods employed by them usually have been either to take friendly utterances of Japanese statesmen and read into them veiled meanings of hostility to this country; or to interpret every appropriation of money made by Japan for her army or navy (appropriations always smaller than our own) and every change made in her military system as a menace to us; or to exaggerate and colour the most trivial and innocent incidents in such ways as to make them appear evidences of secret plots either to attack us at once or to secure a dangerous military footing on or near our shore so as to be ready to attack us in the future.

A good illustration of the latter is the famous Magdalena Bay alarm of 1911.

In the spring of that year a highly sensational report was published widely by the papers of the country to the effect that the Japanese government had purchased a large tract of land on Magdalena Bay, on the coast of Lower California, with the object of fortifying the place and establishing there a powerful naval base. This was declared to be one more evidence of the hostility of Japan and her secret design to invade our shores. The report was so widely circulated and believed that the matter was taken up in the United States Senate and the American government ordered an investigation to be made. What was the result? It was found that the Japanese government had neither made any such purchase nor taken any steps looking in the direction of such a purchase. The sole basis for the story was that an American syndicate had obtained possession of some land on Magdalena Bay with the hope of selling it to Japan. But Japan would have absolutely nothing to do with it.

A still more famous alarm was that connected with Turtle Bay in the year 1915, which is still fresh in the minds of many.

After some preliminary hints that a dark plot of Japan against us was being unearthed, the New York *Herald* in its issue of April 15th of the year named came out with a most sensational and detailed report to the effect that Japan had actually sent a naval and military force and was secretly establishing at Turtle Bay on the coast of Lower California, only four hundred miles from San Diego and therefore within easy striking distance of our Pacific Coast cities, a strong military and naval base. The report was printed under big scare headings and occupied two thirds of a page of the *Herald*. It was eagerly caught up by the press of the country and carried to every part of the land, the more sensational papers giving it startling headings and in many cases adding editorials emphasizing the gravity of the situation, anathematizing all foolish and unpatriotic persons who refused to be alarmed, and calling frantically upon the country to protect itself by building more battleships and greatly increasing its army.

The exact things discovered in Turtle Bay according to the *Herald* story (and the writer declared, "I saw them there") were: Five Japanese warships, six colliers and supply ships, four thou-

sand Japanese marines and sailors in actual occupation of Turtle Bay, the harbour mined, a wireless telegraphic plant in operation, one or more Japanese patrol ships guarding the approach to the harbour, while armed men and sixty tons of ammunition were landed, six hundred Japanese sailors armed with rifles marching daily down to the beach from some concealed place back behind the camp.

With such an alarming story as this in all the papers of the land, and half of them giving credence to it, of course the government felt compelled to make an investigation. Accordingly, as soon as possible, Commodore Irwin of the U. S. cruiser *New Orleans* visited Turtle Bay, and what did he find? Simply a sensational "yarn," fabricated out of practically nothing. In the preceding December a Japanese cruiser had grounded on a mud bank in the bay and was abandoned. Recently the Japanese government had sent to the place a repair ship and a coal vessel, and these were engaged in a peaceful and wholly legitimate endeavour to rescue the stranded vessel—an endeavour in which our own government had offered to assist them if desired.

This was the whole basis of the scare. Indeed

the repair ship with its attendant coaling boat, two British colliers, and four fishing craft comprised everything found in the bay. The five warships, five out of the six reported Japanese colliers, the four thousand marines and sailors, the mined harbour, the wireless telegraphic plant in operation, the patrol ships guarding the bay, the landing of armed men and of sixty tons of ammunition, the camp on shore and the daily marching of armed men to the beach from a secret place back of the camp, were all a pure fiction.

When the government report exposing the fiction was published, what did the papers of the country do? Of course some of the better ones took pains to let their readers know the facts; but very large numbers either made no mention at all of what had been found out, or else did it so briefly and in such obscure type that few readers became aware of the correction, and the consequence is that multitudes of people in all parts of the land still believe the Turtle Bay yarn, and continue to cite it as proof of Japan's hostility and secret intention to invade this country. The New York *Outlook*, commenting on the wretched affair, well said: "This sensational story was something more serious than the ordinary insult

to the intelligence of newspaper readers, because it concerned relations with a friendly people. The journals that printed it ought to apologize to their readers." How many did apologize?

The Magdalena Bay and Turtle Bay fictions are simply samples. A great number of others of a similar character, all equally without foundation, have been sprung on an unsuspecting public at opportune times, now in this quarter, now in that. Mr. George Kennan has compiled a list of twenty-two of these sinister yarns. Mr. Kawakami in an article in the *Atlantic Monthly* refers to six others. Ever since 1906 the pot has been kept boiling.

A favourite form of these stories is one which represents great numbers of Japanese as being discovered at one place or another, secretly organized and drilling as soldiers for the purpose of attacking the country or joining an invading army later to arrive from Japan.

For example: A little more than a year ago a certain group of papers published from the Atlantic to the Pacific a series of highly sensational reports declaring that there are "two hundred thousand trained Japanese soldiers in Mexico," all ready at the word of command to invade the United States.

These men are not known as soldiers, we were told; to prevent suspicion they are all disguised as farmers, gardeners, miners, clerks, bookkeepers, and so forth; but as a fact all are trained fighters and their real business in Mexico is to aid in the coming invasion of the northern republic.

Since these reports were sent out so widely and were believed by large numbers of persons in the United States to be true, the Japanese Legation in Mexico City took up the matter and made an investigation, and the Japan Society of New York in its Bulletin No. 34 (dated October 23, 1916) gave the result. The facts turned out to be, that there are in the whole of Mexico not to exceed two thousand Japanese persons, all told, counting both sexes and all ages. Of these two thousand about three hundred are women and children, leaving the total number of men not above seventeen hundred. Nor is this all. It also turned out that only a small proportion of these seventeen hundred men (not more than ten per cent.) had ever received any military training. Thus the awful menace of two hundred thousand trained Japanese soldiers, ready at any time to come down on our nation "like a wolf on the fold" and capture us all, shrunk to some

170 men, scattered in all parts of Mexico, from the United States border on the north to Central America on the south, for the most part having no connection with one another and not even knowing one another, but all of them peaceful men simply pursuing their different vocations like other peaceful persons; and most or all of them industrious, respected, and valuable members of the various communities of which they formed parts.

A corresponding report has been widely circulated throughout the country to the effect that there are seventy thousand trained Japanese troops in California, masquerading as farmers, miners, day labourers, merchants, and civilians generally, but really an advance army ready to assist when the time comes in the capture of our Pacific Coast. This report, too, silly as it is, amazing as it is, has been investigated, and of course turns out to be as unfounded and as wanton as that of the two hundred thousand Japanese soldiers in Mexico.

Here we get an insight into the methods by which suspicion of Japan has been created in this country. Of all the stories and so-called proofs of Japan's hostility, and secret purpose to invade our shores, that have been put into circulation

among us during the past ten years, not one has had any more basis in fact than the Magdalena Bay and Turtle Bay yarns, and the reports of the two hundred thousand trained Japanese soldiers in Mexico and the seventy thousand in California. Absolutely every one has been shown to be baseless. And yet designing men who are hostile to Japan, or who for some reason would like to create trouble between Japan and ourselves, or who are unscrupulous enough to employ this method of frightening this country into increased naval appropriations, have continued to circulate these stories; and a well-meaning but misled public has continued to believe them. Thus two great and honourable nations that ought to be friends, respecting and trusting each other, have been to a greater or less degree estranged, and everything possible has been done to make them foes.¹

¹ Notwithstanding the fact that Japan is actually fighting by our side in a common war, certain hostile critics have sought to make us suspicious of her, by declaring that she has done and is doing very little in the war, and thus is proving false to her obligations. Is the assertion true? No. Let me cite the testimony of the *Outlook*. Says that journal (Oct. 3, 1917): "The capture of Kiao-chau was a great deal more than the dislodgment of a German force from the only German possession in the Far East. It put Germany out of the Pacific, and made commerce safe for the Allies in the Far East. Together with Japan's

On the very day that the distinguished Japanese Commission landed on our shores (in August, 1917), bringing a message of fraternal good will and an expression of the desire of the Japanese government to co-operate with us in the heartiest and most effective ways in the war for liberty in Europe, a long, sensational, illustrated, syndicated article of the most venomous type was published in a great number of papers in all parts of the country, aiming to thwart the aims of the Commission and poison the mind of the nation with the idea that all the aims of Japan are sinister, that the purpose of the Commission was to deceive us, and that even if Japan refrains from attacking us while the war in Europe continues, she will only strike us the harder when the war is over.

help in the capture of the notorious German raider *Emden*, and Japan's service in convoying Australian troops to England, it meant that she cleared the Pacific from the Teutonic danger.

"But this is only a part of Japan's actual service so far rendered. She has furnished vast quantities of munitions, cloth, and supplies of all kinds to Russia over the Trans-Siberian railway—a service which Japan was the only nation in position to render. Still another definite service rendered was the despatch of naval ships from Japan to the Mediterranean to aid the Allies in meeting the submarine warfare in those waters, thus releasing other vessels for use in the Atlantic."

All these forms of aid to the Allies have been simply invaluable. The fact is, from the beginning Japan has shirked no responsibility but has done her full share in the war.

How can such a devil article be accounted for? Is there any other explanation so reasonable as to suppose it inspired by German enmity to the United States and paid for by German money, with the hope that, if the American people can be deeply alarmed over Japan, their energies may be correspondingly diverted from prosecuting the war against Germany?

As this illustrated and syndicated article, so shamefully slandering Japan, is one of the latest of its kind and is a good sample of a whole venomous brood, it seems worth while briefly to examine it. It lies before me as I write. It is accompanied by a picture of the author, whose name I withhold. It is also accompanied with a map of the world, on which a heavy black line is drawn inclosing most of the waters and islands of the Pacific Ocean, together with Japan, Korea, Manchuria, the whole of China, the French possessions to the south of China, the Kingdom of Siam, Tibet, and the whole of India. This vast area we are told is to be included in the empire which Japan is insidiously planning to create. This, however, is only the Asiatic part. In addition to this she proposes to conquer and add to it the United States and all the Latin republics,

that is, all of North and South America except Canada. In view of her alliance with Great Britain she generously consents to refrain from adding Canada to her empire at present. Still further, on the map is also portrayed, as its most startling feature, the figure of a huge, hideous Japanese soldier standing on the sea between Japan and Korea and casting his black shadow entirely across the Pacific, one of the shadow's hands holding a rifle, and the other, gigantic in size, reaching out to seize both Americas. Under the map and picture in large heavy black letters are the words: "Here's how Japan is threatening to establish a great Asiatic autocracy dominating the Pacific, with its eastern tip forming a dagger threatening the very shores of the United States and the Latin-American republics."

The Asiatic part of this huge empire we are informed is to comprise seven million square miles of territory and a population of one billion. Adding the Americas, the empire's total area is to be about nineteen million square miles and its total population about 1,160,000,000. Thus when Germany is conquered and her ambition for world dominion has failed, Japan is to take up the same rôle, and unless we arm heavily against

her and thwart her secret ambitions, she is to conquer and rule us and practically the whole world except Canada and Europe.

Incredible as it seems, this is the kind of thing that for a dozen years has been put before the people of the United States in a hundred forms, through newspapers, magazines, books, and photo-plays, by hundreds of secret enemies of Japan, many of whom we have reason to believe are secret allies of Germany.

Is there any ground for these representations? Not the slightest. They are fabrications from beginning to end. No man has ever been able to show one single fact justifying anything of the kind. They are the creations either of ignorance, dense prejudice, or the sinister motives of evil men. Under the pretence of rousing America to protect herself from danger, their only possible effect is to injure America, to stab Japan, and to help Germany.

Do the American people believe these representations? Yes; millions of them do. That is the strange, dark, dangerous thing, for when nations circulate and believe such evil reports about one another, wars become inevitable. Why do we in America believe these suspicion-breeding,

fear-breeding, hate-breeding, war-breeding declarations about Japan? Not because they are true, but simply and only because they are put before us times without number, especially in newspapers that are ever ready to print sensations, and we do not see them contradicted. As a fact, they are contradicted and exposed in almost every case, and by men of the highest authority; but the contradictions do not get into the papers that publish the sensations, or if they do, it is usually in the smallest type and the most obscure corners where they are seen by not one in ten of the persons who have read and been influenced by the scare-headed fabrications and slanders. The force of uncontradicted iteration and reiteration is almost omnipotent. Said Mr. Dooley to Mr. Hennessy: "I'll believe anything, *anything*, if ye'll tell it to me of'en enuf." This explains exactly the credence given by multitudes in this country to the sensational things they read about Japan. We know that children can be made to believe things the most absurd if they are always taught them and never hear anything to the contrary. The same is largely true with men, both individuals and nations. By an organized campaign of misrepresentation and calumny car-

ried on for a series of years any one of the great nations in the world can be filled with suspicion and fear of any other nation with which it has relations. Such a campaign as has been conducted in this country against Japan would have created alienation even between us and England, the nation nearest of kin to ourselves, had it been directed against her. So powerful for evil is the influence of reiterated, persistent, and uncontradicted misrepresentations and slanders.

Alas! most of us have a lot of the Mr. Dooley in us. There are few things so absurd that we do not believe them *if they are "told to us of'en enuf."*

It is particularly to be regretted that any causes of estrangement should have sprung up between Japan and the United States after the happy friendship that has existed so long between them, and after the earnest efforts put forth by the Japanese people to make that friendship permanent, and to show their abiding esteem for the people of America.

How can we as a people be unmindful of the many ties that bind the two nations together? How can we forget that in her long and trying task of reshaping her national ideals and adjust-

ing herself to the civilization of the western world, Japan has looked to us for help and leadership more than to any other nation?

How can we forget the large number of Americans, many of them men of eminence, whom she has invited to Japan for longer or shorter periods, some for long terms of years, to serve her in highly honourable and responsible positions as her advisers and teachers in education, in science, in finance, in almost all departments of her national life?

How can we forget that she has sent far more of her best young men to the United States to be educated than to any other country—young men who by their almost uniformly high ability and high character, and also by their subsequent careers of honourable distinction at home after their return from this country, have been an honour both to their own nation and to our universities and scientific schools where they have received their training?

How can we overlook the exceedingly cordial welcome Japan has always extended to American missionaries, notwithstanding the fact that they came to teach a religion different from her own?

How can we be oblivious of the generous and

warm-hearted hospitality which she unfailingly extends to Americans who visit her Empire?

Finally, how can we forget that one of the finest monuments in Japan, and one that she points to with pride, is a beautiful statue of the American Commodore Perry, erected by the Japanese people on the pine-clad beach of Kurihama, where that distinguished naval commander first set foot on Nippon's soil, to summon Japan to take her place in the fraternity of the world's nations?

Americans visiting Japan may find in the archives of the Imperial University of Tokyo many relics and memorials of Commodore Perry which are guarded with great care as treasures of the Empire. Among them are Perry's original treaty between the United States and Japan, elaborately engrossed and bearing its great seal, numerous scrolls painted by Japanese artists of that time, pictures of the American vessels, and portraits of the officers. Also should be mentioned the famous small engine and train and the telegraph apparatus sent by President Fillmore as presents to the Shogun. These are all preserved with scrupulous care as valued memorials of a man whom the Japanese people have never ceased to hold in high honour, and of a friendship with

the American nation which Japan has always prized.

Is this friendship which has existed for more than sixty years without a break, and alike honourable to both nations, to be allowed to be put in jeopardy by mischief-makers, by ignorant, reckless, prejudiced, or designing men, with consequences sure to follow of the most seriously harmful character alike to Japan and to ourselves?

CHAPTER VII

THE MENACE OF A JAPANESE INVASION OF AMERICA (Continued)

Is such an Invasion Probable? Is it Possible?

I COME now to the part of my subject which is far more important than any other; which for several years has been widely agitating the mind of the American people, and to which all that has been said hitherto in these pages leads up. It is the question: Is the United States in danger of a Japanese attack or invasion?

Some of the reasons for believing that we are in no such danger are the following:

First: There are many and weighty evidences that the national ideal which Japan has set before herself and toward which she has been steadily pressing ever since she opened her ports to the western world, is not a career of military conquest, but one of ever growing industrial and commercial development—a career of leadership in the East in the arts and sciences, in manufactures,

in trade, and in finance, similar to that of England or Germany (Germany apart from her military obsession) in the West.

True, she has proved by her recent history that her people are brave fighters if the necessity arises, as peaceful peoples are likely to be. But the declaration made by some that she has been in the past or is now a nation ambitious for war, rests on no foundation. As we have already seen, up to the past generation she has had no war of any kind for nearly three centuries, and no foreign war for more than four times as long. Until we or some other nation of Europe can show a peace record even approximating this, it ill becomes us to point to the Japanese as a people dangerous on account of their warlike nature.¹

¹ Several years ago Dr. John H. DeForest, who lived thirty-three years in Japan and obtained as thorough a knowledge of the Japanese people and of the spirit of the nation as perhaps any American has ever done, heard one of the incendiary addresses against Japan which Captain R. P. Hobson has delivered in so many parts of the United States, in which that bellicose gentleman affirmed the warlike and dangerous character of Japan and our need to arm against her. A few days after hearing the address, Dr. DeForest published in the *Hartford Courant* an "Open Letter" to Mr. Hobson, in which among other things he said:

"Please let me ask you, Captain Hobson, where did you learn all this that you say about the warlike character of Japan? Isn't your history a little loose? I should suppose that a Congress-

Of course there is a militaristic jingo element in Japan, as unfortunately there is in America, and in every other land. This element is dangerous wherever found. But the assurances which I received in Japan from public leaders and men of wide knowledge, as well as my own observations there, convinced me that this jingo element, so far from representing the nation as a whole, is somewhat less numerous, less influential, and therefore less dangerous than is the corresponding element in this country. The truth seems to be

man would know that for two hundred and fifty years before Commodore Perry's visit there was no nation on earth that could compare with Japan in the peace habit. While Europe and America were in the midst of long years of bitter wars, revolutions, and mutual slaughters, there were for two hundred and fifty years neither internal nor external disturbances of peace in the Empire of Japan. I take it that you neither read nor speak the Japanese language, and so have only second-hand avenues into the literature and history of Japan. So, in your hasty tour through a section of that country, you could not have noticed that at the entrance of countless villages a high flag-staff stands, at the base of which is written: 'Peace be to this Village.' Have you ever compared the national hymn of Japan with those of the nations of the West? For hymns to be national they must express the deepest and strongest sentiment of the nation. If therefore Japan is a lover of war it will certainly be expressed in her national hymn. What do we find? There is in it not a shadow or suggestion of war. We of the West have to be careful how we sing our national hymns where representatives of different nations are gathered. But Japan's national hymn is so absolutely without the war spirit that it can be sung anywhere in the world without giving the slightest offence."

that the statesmen of Japan and also the great body of the people very clearly realize that in this age of the world peace is the only road to prosperity for any nation.

Second: Especially does Japan desire to preserve peaceful relations with *America*. I believe there is no nation, not even Great Britain, with which she would so much regret the opening of hostilities as with the United States. Even looking at the matter in the most selfish light she does not want war with us, because she knows that she could not possibly gain anything by it, but would be sure to lose much.

But she wants peace with us from other than selfish reasons. As already pointed out, ever since the days of Commodore Perry (and I might add, Mr. Townsend Harris, our first permanent representative in Japan, who rendered service of the highest value to both nations and won a lasting place in the regard of the Japanese people), Japan has peculiarly prized the friendship of this country. When I was in Japan I had the privilege of conferring with many leading men in all walks of life. Everywhere the sentiment they expressed was the same. All said to me in effect: "We highly honour and esteem your nation. Our

earnest desire is (and, so far as the issue lies in our hands, our determination also) that there shall be perpetual peace between us and you. War between us would be a blunder, a calamity, a crime. It is simply unthinkable." Even men who felt deeply the indignities heaped upon their countrymen in California said to me: "There must be no war; our difficulties must be settled by methods of peace."

With regard to this very important matter of the feeling in Japan toward this country, I do not wish readers to rely upon my own statements alone. So much that is of serious import to both nations is involved in it, that I deem it important to cite evidences of a character not to be doubted. In proof of the friendship of the Japanese people for the United States, and the aversion existing in almost the entire responsible part of the nation to everything even looking in the direction of war between the two countries, it would be easy to give testimonies sufficient to fill a volume, and from the most weighty and reliable possible sources. From the much larger number of such testimonies that lie before me as I write, I cite the following. Space does not permit me to give more.

If any Americans know the truth about Japan, and especially about the mind, the spirit, and the aims of the men at the head of affairs, surely it is our ambassadors. And surely these responsible representatives of our nation can have no motive for deceiving us.

Said Mr. George W. Guthrie, our late Ambassador: "There is no reason under the sun for the people of the United States to distrust the people of Japan; any more than there is for the people of Japan to distrust the United States."

Said Hon. Luke Wright, our former Ambassador to Japan, on his return to the United States: "The talk of war between this country and Japan isn't even respectable nonsense. Japan no more wants war with us than we want war with her, and the idea that there is an impending conflict is ridiculous."

At a meeting of the leading American residents of all professions held in the city of Yokohama late in 1915, resolutions were unanimously adopted of which the following is an extract:

It has come to our knowledge that in sections of the United States rumours have been circulated to the effect that public sentiment in Japan is hostile to the United States, and that the Japanese gov-

ernment entertains sinister purposes of a dangerous character.

The rumours in question are based upon misinformation, or, even worse, the hope of selfish advantage. We believe, upon evidence that cannot be doubted, there is not to be found in the Japanese Empire any wish or thought other than to maintain the most friendly and cordial relations with the Republic of the United States, and that any representations to the contrary, wherever emanating, and from whatever cause proceeding, are baseless calumnies.

If any Americans know the Japanese people, all the people, it is our missionaries, for their work takes them among all classes from the highest to the lowest in both city and country. It is only a little while since one hundred American missionaries, of all denominations, deeply troubled by the "irresponsible utterances of a section of the American press, and their slanders of Japan," united in sending a message to the people of this country, denying the "belligerent attitude" of Japan and saying:

Feeling bound to do all in our power to remove misunderstandings and suspicions which are tending to interrupt a long-standing friendship between our two nations, we wish to bear testimony to the sobriety, sense of international justice, and freedom from aggressive designs exhibited by the great majority of

the Japanese people and to their faith in the traditional justice and equity of the United States.

Few men in this country know Japan better than does ex-President Taft, and few have spoken stronger words in deprecation of the miserable jingoism which so long has been striving to stir up antagonism between the two nations. Says that distinguished and honoured American:

It would be a crime against modern civilization if Japan and America went to war; and it would be at once hateful and insane. The people of both countries are alike repugnant to the idea and the governments of both countries may be trusted to be faithful to the people's wishes in this serious matter.

No American has given stronger testimony as to the high character of the Japanese, or spoken weightier words on the importance of treating Japan honourably and thus preserving cordial relations between the two nations, than ex-President Roosevelt. In his annual message in 1906 he said:

The overwhelming mass of our people cherish a lively regard and respect for the people of Japan, and in almost every quarter of the Union the stranger from Japan is treated as he deserves. There are no first-class colleges and universities in the land, in-

cluding the universities and colleges of California, which do not gladly welcome Japanese students and on which Japanese students do not reflect credit. I ask fair treatment everywhere in this country for the Japanese as I would ask fair treatment for Germans, or Englishmen, Frenchmen, Russians, or Italians. I ask it as due to humanity and civilization. Throughout Japan Americans are well treated, and any failure on our part here to treat the Japanese with a like courtesy and consideration is by just so much a confession of inferiority in our civilization.

Some of the most malignant attacks upon the Japanese people and some of the most ridiculous efforts to convince the American people that Japan is a menace to this country have originated in California. It should also be said to the honour of California that some of the best answers to this malignity, and some of the stoutest defences of the honour of Japan have come from the same State. As an illustration of the latter I will quote briefly from an article in the *North American Review*, of July, 1917, written by Mr. F. W. Henshaw, Associate Justice of the California Supreme Court. The writer of this article speaks with the authority of one who knows, of one on the ground, who lives in the very region where the foolish, worked up, wicked prejudice against the Japan-

ese has been most acute, and one who dares to face and expose the mischief makers that are doing so much to embroil us with a great and friendly nation. Says Judge Henshaw:

Public discussion of our present and future relations with Japan has been left almost wholly to the demagogues of politics and to the public press. Even our government has done nothing to disabuse the minds of the people of the ridiculous fear of the "menace of Japan," or the "yellow peril." When it should have spoken aloud it has remained silent. It is little less than criminal to allow this anti-Japanese propaganda to go forward at this time unanswered and unrebuked. Its foundation is ignorance, its superstructure is self-serving falsehood. Japan is admittedly one of the world's great powers. She is our ally in a war which is rocking civilization from turret to foundation stone. No American can point to any wrong, even the slightest, which she has ever done us or threatened to do us. . . . Side by side the United States and Japan are striving to defeat the menace of Germany, and they will do so. Can it be believed by any mind above that of an anthropoid ape that Japan has contemplated, is contemplating, or will contemplate following Germany in a like career, and that, if she does, she will select for her first victim a nation many times stronger than herself and at a distance which renders anything but a naval raid against our coast ridiculous to contemplate?

Here is the simple truth, and it is time that it be publicly recorded: We shall have war with Japan

only if we seek it. We shall have war with Japan only if our course of conduct toward her becomes intolerable for a proud nation. We shall have war with Japan only if we inflict on her insults and wrongs which will force her to do as Germany forced us to do. And further, let it be recorded that, actually, we have been doing this for ten years.

Within the last half dozen years many distinguished Americans have visited Japan, having it for one of their distinct objects to ascertain the real feeling of that nation toward this country—as to whether it is friendly or hostile, whether it wants war or peace. Among these visitors have been ex-President Charles W. Eliot of Harvard University, ex-Chancellor David Starr Jordan of Leland Stanford University, and Dr. Hamilton Wright Mabie of the *Outlook*. These men have been given the very widest opportunity to come in contact with the leading minds of Japan in all spheres, intellectual, political, educational, military, industrial, and social. Surely their testimonies ought to be more trustworthy than the utterances found in our sensational papers.

Dr. Eliot tells us that he found wherever he went in Japan “an almost neighbourly feeling” for the United States.

It is criminal [he declares] for politicians, newspapers and others to give voice or lend ear to statements to the contrary. Japanese statesmen are not ordinarily willing to speak of even a possible war between their country and the United States, so very absurd do they regard the idea to be.

On returning from the Orient Dr. Jordan bore this testimony:

I have not found in Japan any of the spirit of war for war's sake, which has been the bane of European politics, nor any desire, on the part of people wise and well informed, for international aggression of any sort. I have found the average public opinion in Japan on the question of friendly relations among nations quite as sane and rational as in any other nation whatever.

Dr. Mabie, on his return, declared:

A war between this country and Japan would be fictitiously created and of great injustice. We think and speak of the Japanese as being an inferior people, but Japan is more highly organized than any country in the world, excepting Germany. The Japanese people have the same brains and emotions that we have. We have been travelling through two different channels, but we are now met on friendly ground after three thousand years. Japan wants to be the interpreter of the East to the West. The keynote of the Japanese people, as expressed by the Emperor himself, is, "Seek knowledge wherever it can be

found in the world." I believe the Japanese people to be as honest as the people of this country are. Moreover, they have one of the most desirable qualities, chivalry. All the Japanese want from the people of America is justice, courtesy, and imagination on our part. All this talk about a war between us and Japan is not only nonsense, it is mischievous nonsense.

Numerous and strong as are the testimonies of Americans, those that come to us from Japanese are still more numerous and not less strong.

Says Professor Inazo Nitobe, in his recent book, *The Japanese Nation* :

Japan is sufficiently sane to count the cost of a war with America. What could we gain by sending our fleet across the Pacific or concentrating our battleships in the Philippines, unmindful that we should thus expose our back naked, as it were, to China and Russia; unmindful of the most important trade we possess—our trade with America; unmindful of the enormous national debt that we already have and of the still greater financial strain which would accrue; unmindful of all the cordial relations of the past? Our statesmen and our people know better than to take such a rash step.

Says the *Japan Advertiser*: "No Japanese Government could propose a war with America and live a day."

Says the editor of the *Japan Mail*:

Before engaging in a war with America Japan would have to divest herself of the strongest sentiments of friendship entertained by her people toward any foreign country.

Says Mr. Tokutomi, of Tokyo (editor of *Koku-min Shinbun*):

Japan has no aggressive intentions against America. Japan's large commerce with America makes her hope that America will be prosperous and a good customer. If Japan were to attack America it would react seriously on Japan. Japan's only anxiety is lest America may entertain aggressive intentions toward this part of the globe.

Writes Captain Uyeno, military attaché of the Japanese Embassy in London:

Such a thing as a war between America and Japan is impossible. Such a thing will never happen. There is a war element, if you care to call it that, in all countries, but the best element in Japan, as in all countries, is for peace, and Japan today entertains nothing but the friendliest feelings toward the United States.—The *Outlook*, May 3, 1913.

In the spring of 1913, when telegrams to Japan told of the thirty-four anti-Japanese bills introduced into the California Legislature, and when alleged (fake) telegrams from Japan told of mobs demanding war with America (though

there were no such mobs), Count Okuma (since Premier) called a meeting of editors, educators, statesmen, and Christian pastors to consider the California question.

This problem [he declared] cannot be solved by diplomacy, nor by legislation, nor by war, least of all by the talk of war; that is the very worst thing. There is only one possible solution. We must appeal to the Christians of America to see that their Christian principles of universal human brotherhood are enacted into law and life.

That did not look very much like a bellicose Japan eager to fight us at the drop of the hat.

In an article in the *Outlook* of December, 1915, Baron Shibusawa, the most influential financier in Japan, employed the following strong words:

As for the fashionable talk about war between Japan and America, it is simply unthinkable. Before it can possibly come both America and Japan must turn into nations of utter idiots or raving maniacs. Such a talk about war is despicable nonsense. It is worse: it is criminal, traitorous stupidity.

If any utterances could possibly be authoritative in showing the feeling of Japan toward America it would be those of the Commission of eminent

men sent by the Japanese government to the United States to confer with President Wilson and Secretary Lansing in August, 1917. Did those utterances lack in friendship, or give any ground for suspicion of hostility toward us on the part of the Japanese people? At a dinner given by the America-Japan Society in Tokyo on the eve of the sailing of the Commission for our shores, Viscount Ishii, the distinguished head of the Commission, said:

An important part of my mission will be to convey to the hundred millions of Americans the sympathy and good will of the seventy millions of Japanese people. The greatest war in the annals of mankind is now at the climax of its bitterness. . . . In spite of the indefatigable efforts of the Germans to bring about discord between Japan and the United States, these two countries are now practically allied in making a common front against this very power, Germany.¹ . . . And now that this universal disturber of the peace has completely and once for all been driven out of her Asiatic bases, there remains no longer any one who ventures to cherish the design of estranging Japan from America.

¹ In his various addresses in this country Viscount Ishii called attention again and again to the persistent and unscrupulous activity of Germany in plots and schemes to create enmity between Japan and the United States,—an activity which he declared had been going on for at least ten years.

The very first words uttered by Viscount Ishii on landing on American soil were:

We come to you at the dawning of a new day. Our message is that in this day your purpose is our purpose, your goal our goal. Our message is that America and Japan will march together, work together, and fight together as comrades, until the end has been reached and the victory won in the struggle which involves our common rights and liberties. We are here to say that in this tremendous struggle for those rights and liberties America and Japan are bound together; and that when the victory of the allied forces is secure, America and Japan should so live that your sons and our sons shall have a certainty of permanent neighbourly and friendly relations. Our two nations should so live that no word or deed of either can be looked upon with suspicion. In the past we have both been the victims of venomous gossip, hired slander, and sinister intrigue. May we so live that in the future these can only serve to bring us closer together for mutual protection.

In the dawning of this new day of stress and strain let us forget the little molchills that have been exaggerated into mountains to bar our good relations. Let us see together with clearer vision the pitfalls dug by a cunning enemy in our path. And when victory shall have been won, let us together help in the upbuilding of a new world, which shall rise, fair and strong and beautiful, from the ashes of the old. We are allies; Japan and America have one aim—the

preservation of democracy; we have one aspiration—the triumph of international justice.

When the Commission reached Washington, Viscount Ishii, speaking in behalf of the Japanese Emperor, addressed President Wilson, employing, among others, the following words:

The auspicious co-operation of the United States of America and Japan in the tremendous task of restoring the reign of mutual confidence and good will among the nations of the earth, cannot but draw us closer together. Our common efforts are directed to seeking an enduring peace based on respect for the independence of the weakest and smallest states; on contempt for the arrogance of materialistic force; on reverence for the pledged word. In the service of these common ideals our two countries must surely realize a far nearer friendship than ever before.

From no land could a nobler message be brought to the United States. Woe to the men who try to kindle suspicion and hate against the nation that brings it!

Third: Even if Japan desired to attack us, she could not do so now, nor so long as the present war continues, for two reasons: first, because her energies are fully taxed and will continue to be so as long as the struggle against Germany lasts;

and second, because attacking us would be turning upon an ally, one fighting in the same cause with herself. Of course our worst Japanophobists have no fear of her doing this.

“But when the war is over,” they tell us, “then let us look out! Then will be her time to strike us.”

Does any intelligent person expect us to believe that a nation which has been our friend in all the past is going to be made our foe by comradeship with us in a common cause, by fighting by our side in a great struggle for the liberty of humanity, liberty in which we are both equally interested?

Fourth: In 1902 and 1905 Japan entered into an alliance offensive and defensive with Great Britain, renewing the same later. What did this compact on her part mean? It meant that even if she wanted to go to war with us, she could not do so, so long as the alliance lasted. Great Britain is a nation kindred to our own. We are associated with her by the closest ties of blood, of common language, of common religion, of common inheritances and traditions, of common interests of a thousand kinds. Our friendship is of the greatest possible importance to her. She could on no condition permit her ally to attack us, even

if that ally were insane enough to desire it. Therefore even the most timid among us may well take heart, and lay aside their alarm for a time. At least so long as the alliance between Japan and Great Britain continues, which is likely to be many years, the American people may retire to their beds at night without apprehension of being awakened before morning by the guns of Japanese battleships bombarding our cities.

Fifth: To launch into a war with a nation as distant as the United States, and as powerful, with any hope whatever of success, would of course require Japan to put forth her utmost strength both by sea and by land. She would be obliged to employ her whole navy, and send to the far-away field of conflict the largest army she could possibly raise and equip.

But what condition would that leave her in at home? Of course it would leave her without adequate protection, and therefore in a condition of danger from both China and Russia, and probably also from Germany.

China has many grievances against Japan, some old, some more recent, that she does not forget. Could she be trusted to practice the extreme self-denial of refraining from taking ad-

vantage of Japan's unprotected state to seek redress?

Russia, although sustaining friendly relations with Japan at the present time, remembers bitterly her defeat in 1905. We may believe that she still continues as ardently to covet Manchuria, Korea, and an ice-free gateway to the Pacific Ocean as when she fought with Japan for these prizes and was defeated. Seeing Japan inadequately defended because of the absence of her military and naval forces in a distant part of the world, could she be trusted not to reach out her hand again to seize these prizes? Indeed, could she be trusted not to reach out her hand still further in an effort to seize Japan itself?

And Germany, what of her? She has long had ambitions in the Orient, and before the great war began had taken long strides toward realizing those ambitions. But Japan thwarted her. Can she forget Japan's action? In the event of Japan's finding herself locked in a terrible struggle in America, her army and navy employed to the utmost of their strength in that distant struggle, could Germany be trusted not to take advantage of Japan's comparatively helpless condition, to strike her, get revenge for Kiao-chau, and wrest

from her foe a stronger foothold in the Orient than she had lost?

The fact that Japan has China and Russia as close neighbours, rivals, and always possible enemies, and that she may count upon Germany remaining her alert and vengeful foe for many years to come, means that her engaging in war with any strong, distant power, would jeopardize not only her possessions in Korea and Manchuria, but her safety at home, and her very life. Nothing less than this would be Japan's peril if she undertook the stupendous task of invading America, as every Japanese statesman and military leader well understands. Will she within any discernible future dare to run such a risk? Would any nation in the world that had not gone stark mad?

Sixth: Commercial reasons would deter Japan from war with us, even if there were no other considerations.

As a nation she is very poor, and is burdened with a very heavy debt. It is true that since the great war in Europe began she has had extraordinary commercial and industrial prosperity. The temporary sweeping of German commerce from the sea and the requisition of a large part of the mercantile shipping of England for war uses

have thrown into her hands, for the time being, an unusually large, indeed an enormously large, ocean carrying trade; very great demands have also been made upon her for the manufacture of munitions and army supplies, particularly for Russia. From both these sources she is reaping large monetary returns. This gives her a degree of immediate financial prosperity greater than perhaps she has ever known. Nevertheless, it remains true that her wealth and her resources for the production of wealth, aside from her manufactures and commerce, are very limited. Of course this means that in order to lift herself out of her poverty it is imperative for her to develop to the utmost both her manufacturing industries and her foreign trade.

For sea-borne commerce no country in the world is better located. As for manufacturing, she has the advantage of possessing a large population and therefore plenty of labour, and also abundant water-power which can easily be converted into electrical power. But she has the disadvantage of possessing only a few of the raw materials needed for manufactures. She has practically no iron mines, and therefore must import her iron and steel. She is also largely dependent

upon other countries for such indispensable staples as cotton, wool, and hides. Her agricultural possibilities are very limited. With an area smaller than the single State of Texas, her surface is so mountainous that only one fourteenth of her soil is arable, and from that small fraction, and from the fish of the surrounding seas, her between fifty and sixty millions of people must be fed.

From all this it is easily seen that her trade with other countries—to obtain raw materials for her manufactures and to convey her manufactured goods to the markets of the world—is simply vital to her. Without it she cannot possibly rise out of her poverty, pay her crushing debt, and maintain her place among the nations.

But a war with America would destroy her commerce, and therefore largely her manufactures. In the first place, the United States is by far the most important of her customers. To lose our trade alone would be a staggering blow to her. But she would not only lose our trade—practically her whole commerce would be swept from the sea. If we could not destroy it in any other way we would build a thousand submarines, or five thousand, if necessary, and in addition to these an aërial fleet of any magnitude required, and a

navy as great as the need. Of course our wealth and our unlimited resources give us possibilities in these directions that she could not overcome. This she well understands. So that this matter alone—the certainty of the ruin of her commerce and the bankruptcy of the nation that it would cause—is a sufficient guaranty that she will never engage in war with this country if she can honourably avoid it, and certainly that she will never indulge in the wild dream of bringing on a war by wantonly invading our shores.

CHAPTER VIII

THE MENACE OF A JAPANESE INVASION OF AMERICA (Concluded)

Is such an Invasion Probable? Is it Possible?

SEVENTH: If Japan desired to invade our shores, how could she reach us? We have a navy which, to say the least, is very much stronger than hers, and which since the opening of the Panama Canal is all available for use on the Pacific. This navy, of course, Japan would have to meet and destroy before she could invade us, indeed before she would dare to embark a single soldier. Could she do it?

Just how strong is her navy, and how does it compare with our own?

Much effort has been made by military alarmists, by enemies of Japan, and others, to create the impression throughout the country that Japan's navy is much larger and more powerful than it is, and that ours is much smaller and weaker than it

is. The object in view has been to create fear of Japan and thus secure larger naval appropriations.

I have nowhere else seen the exact facts and figures as to the relative size and effectiveness of the two fleets set forth in a manner so comprehensive, so concise, and so lucid, as by Mr. K. K. Kawakami, in the *Chicago Unity* of May 4, 1916, and in the *North American Review* of the same month.¹ I am sure I cannot do better than to quote his statement at some length. If any readers do not care for so many details they can easily pass them by. But the subject is so important, and there is so much lack of information concerning it in the public mind, and so much positive misinformation, that I think many will be glad to have placed before them the full facts and figures as given by Mr. Kawakami. Says this high authority:

At present Japan's fleet consists of 6 dreadnoughts including 2 now under construction, 4 battle-cruisers, 13 battleships of the pre-dreadnought type, 4 cruisers, 50 destroyers, and 17 submarines. All told, Japan's warships aggregate 560,484 tons.

As against this strength, America has a fleet totalling 1,271,117 tons, that is, 710,633 tons more than the

¹ Mr. Kawakami is the author of *American-Japanese Relations and Asia at the Door*.

Japanese squadron. To enter into details, the American navy, as it stands today, consists of 19 dreadnoughts (including two now under construction and known as *No. 43* and *No. 44*), 23 battleships of the pre-dreadnought type, 10 cruisers, 63 destroyers, 51 submarines, and 22 colliers.

The face of these figures shows that the Japanese navy has about one-half the strength of the American navy. But when we study the nature of the ships on both sides the inferiority of the Japanese fleet becomes all the more obvious.

In the first place, the American dreadnoughts are much larger than the Japanese. Of the American fleet, the 7 largest dreadnoughts have each a displacement of 32,600 tons, while the 4 largest Japanese dreadnoughts are of a displacement of 30,600 tons each. Again, as against 6 American dreadnoughts of 27,500 tons each, Japan has only 4 battle-cruisers of the same size. The remaining 2 dreadnoughts of Japan are of a displacement of 20,800 tons each, whereas the United States has 2 dreadnoughts of 27,343 tons each, 2 others of 21,825 tons each, 2 others of 20,000 tons each, and still 2 others of 16,000 tons each.

In the second place the American dreadnoughts are equipped with larger numbers of more powerful guns than are the Japanese. Of 19 American dreadnoughts, 7 are equipped with twelve 14-inch guns, 4 with ten 14-inch guns, 2 with twelve 12-inch guns, 4 with ten 12-inch guns, 2 with eight 12-inch guns. On the Japanese side, there is not a single dreadnought equipped with so many as twelve 14-inch guns. To be more accurate, of 6 Japanese dreadnoughts, 4

have only ten 14-inch guns, while 2 are equipped with twelve 12-inch guns. The Japanese battle-cruisers, 4 in all, have each only eight 14-inch guns.

In the third place, Japan has 13 battleships of the pre-dreadnought type totalling 193,666 tons, while the United States has 23 with a total displacement of 314,906 tons. Here it is important to note that only 2 of the 13 Japanese battleships are fit to stand on the first line of battle, as against six of America's.

In the fourth place, America has 62 destroyers as against Japan's 50. On the face of these figures the differences do not seem very great, but we must remember that most American destroyers are over 800 tons, and therefore sea-going, while the Japanese navy has only 6 destroyers above 800 tons. Most Japanese destroyers are not sea-going, but are for coast defence. Thus 62 American destroyers have a total tonnage of 73,097, while fifty Japanese destroyers aggregate only 36,118 tons.

In the fifth place, Japan has only 17 submarines as against America's 51. Here, too, most American submarines are of a large type and sea-going, while Japan's are not.

In the sixth place, the American navy has 22 colliers aggregating 236,401 tons, while Japan has none. In a naval expedition to distant waters the collier is as important as the fighting craft. The reason the Japanese navy is without colliers is that it is primarily intended to protect Chinese and Japanese waters which are within easy reach of its base of operation.¹

¹ Not only is the Japanese navy unprovided with colliers; it should also be added that Japan possesses not a single coaling

This, in brief, is the relative naval strength of Japan and the United States. Thus it is evident that *the American navy is almost three times as powerful as the Japanese navy.*

Mr. Kawakami's figures were compiled early in 1916, but in most particulars they apply perfectly to present conditions. Japan's navy has changed a little in the direction of increased efficiency. Ours has changed more, and in the same direction. So that the relative superiority of the American fleet is even greater today than twenty months ago.

Mr. Jiuji G. Kasai, author of *The Mastery of the Pacific*, has given us in the *New York Evening Post* (April 1, 1916), a careful statement of the comparative strength of the navies of Japan and the United States. The ground covered is essentially the same as that of Mr. Kawakami and the conclusions reached almost identical. However, as his facts and figures are given in a somewhat different order and are grouped somewhat differently, it will enable readers to see the relative size and effectiveness of the two fleets a little more

station in or near the route to America, or anywhere near the American coast. These two facts alone make the transportation of a great army to this country, together with its convoying battle fleet, an utter impossibility.

clearly if I give a part of his statement. Says Mr. Kasai:

During the decade from 1906 to 1915 the United States appropriated \$1,288,403,099 for the upbuilding and maintenance of its navy, as against Japan's appropriation of \$379,408,324; that is, the United States expended about four times as much as did Japan—with this stupendous sum creating for itself a fighting fleet second to none except that of Great Britain.

The American navy has 14 dreadnoughts already completed and 5 dreadnoughts under construction, namely, the *California*, *Mississippi*, and *Idaho*, No. 43 and No. 44, the last two incorporating valuable lessons learned in the present war. The 19 battleships of the first line will have a total displacement of 507,636 tons. Besides, she has 23 battleships of the second line (314,906 tons), 10 armoured cruisers (140,080 tons), 25 cruisers (126,330 tons), 62 destroyers (73,097 tons), and 51 submarines.

In comparison with this mighty American navy, Japan has 3 dreadnoughts—*Fuso*, *Kawachi*, *Settsu*—and 4 battle-cruisers of the *Kongo* class, making a total of 7 battleships of the first line. In addition she is now building three dreadnoughts of the *Fuso* class, which will be completed by 1918, thus making a total of 10 battleships of the first line, aggregating 274,000 tons. Besides, she has 11 battleships of the second line (179,100 tons), 4 armoured cruisers (56,750 tons), 21 cruisers (133,531 tons), 50 destroyers (36,116 tons), and 17 submarines. This comparison

of the two navies shows plainly that the number and tonnage of the American battleships are double those of the Japanese navy.

But when we compare the fighting ships of the two navies and their equipments, the preponderance of the United States navy is very marked. When the keel of the *Fuso* was laid in 1911 she was the most powerful dreadnought ever designed by any navy; but today she is far outranked by the *California* class of the American navy. All of the American dreadnoughts built after the *Pennsylvania* are driven by oil and electricity, while the *Fuso* class is driven by coal power, which is much inferior.

As to the 23 battleships of the American second line, all of them but three have been completed since 1904, while of Japan's 13, nine were built before 1900, and four were Russian warships captured at Port Arthur.

While the United States has 10 fast armoured cruisers of over 13,500 tons, Japan has but 4. The United States has 22 fuel ships, totalling 236,401 tons, among which the *Jupiter* and the *Jason* are of nearly 200,000 tons, while Japan has no colliers at all.

The fighting strength of a modern navy is largely determined by the gun power of the main batteries of its battleship fleet. At present the United States navy has sixty-four 14-inch guns, thirty-two 13-inch guns, and one hundred and forty-eight 12-inch guns, as against the Japanese navy of thirty-eight 14-inch guns and seventy-two 12-inch guns. When the five dreadnoughts now under construction are added to the fleet, by 1918, the American navy will possess one hundred and twenty-four 14-inch guns, as against

Japan's seventy-four 14-inch guns. These data show conclusively that the American navy has *more than twice the fighting strength of the Japanese navy.*

Here then we have the exact situation so far as navies are concerned. The first task Japan would have to perform in order to invade this country would be that of meeting and overcoming a fleet which conservatively estimated is between two and three times as strong as her own. Readers may judge how easy that task would be.¹

¹ Assertions have been made in some quarters and widely circulated, that whatever may be the comparative naval strength of the two nations now, Japan is building warships faster than we are, and is planning for greater increases in the future. Mr. Kawakami shows that the exact opposite is true. On this subject he gives the following facts and figures:

"Japan has never been building warships on so extensive a scale as America. As early as October 10, 1903, the United States adopted a naval program in pursuance of which she was to build 34 battleships before 1910. By 1907 the American navy was twice as powerful as the Japanese and by 1910 it had become almost three times as powerful as the Japanese navy, because in the preceding two years the United States launched 6 dreadnoughts while Japan launched only 3.

"In Europe, Germany adopted a naval-expansion program in 1907, Russia in 1911, France in 1911, Italy in 1910, and Austria in 1912. In the meantime Japan had no definite naval program to follow, and was lagging behind the Western Powers in the matter of naval preparation. When at last she followed the example of Europe and America and adopted a plan it was only on a very small scale.

"This new Japanese program calls for the construction, in the five years from 1917 to 1921, of 4 dreadnoughts, 6 cruisers,

Eighth: Even if Japan had been able to sink our whole navy, how could she provide transportation across the broadest ocean in the world, a distance of fifty-seven hundred miles, for the army that would be necessary? Has she the shipping?

10 destroyers, and 9 submarines. This requires an expenditure of \$95,000,000 in five yearly installments.

"Compare this with the great naval program recommended by Secretary Daniels, and we see how modest the Japanese plan is. The American program calls for the building of 10 battleships, 6 battle-cruisers, 10 scout cruisers, 50 destroyers, 15 sea-going submarines, 85 coast defense submarines, 4 gunboats, 1 hospital ship, 2 ammunition ships, 2 fuel oil ships, and 1 repair ship. This entails an expenditure of \$442,964,087 in the five years from 1917 to 1921, that is to say, four times the sum required by the Japanese plan.

"Presuming that both the Japanese and American programs were carried out as they have been formulated, the relative strength of the navies of the two countries at the end of 1921 will be as follows:

"The Japanese navy—8 dreadnoughts, 4 battle-cruisers, 15 battleships, of the pre-dreadnought type, 10 cruisers, 60 destroyers, 27 submarines.

"The American navy—27 dreadnoughts, 6 battle-cruisers, 25 battleships of the pre-dreadnought type, 20 cruisers, 112 destroyers, 151 submarines, 24 colliers.

"A glance at the above tables reveals that the American armada will be about three times as powerful as the Japanese squadron. But the figures are misleading. When we consider that the American ships are equipped with a larger number of more powerful guns than are the Japanese vessels, that most of the American destroyers and submarines are sea-going, that the American navy is better supplied with fuel ships and other auxiliary ships—when we consider all these conditions it would

Our jingoes (even some of our Congressmen) have talked about her attacking us with two hundred thousand, three hundred thousand, five hundred thousand men. How could she get them over here, together with the mountains on mountains of munitions which a great war would

seem that the American navy would have almost four times the strength of the Japanese navy by the end of 1921."

Neither the figures of Mr. Kawakami nor those of Mr. Kasai tell the whole story as to the enormous augmentation of our naval appropriations and our navy's immense increase of strength during the past year. Said Secretary Daniels in an address at the Naval Academy in Annapolis on September 14, 1917: "Since the first of August, 1916, Congress has appropriated for the support and increase of the navy \$1,344,184,896, while estimates now pending carry an addition of nearly six hundred millions. Thus the aggregate appropriation for naval purposes in a little more than a year, including pending estimates, is nearly \$2,000,000,000. Nor is this all. The increase in personnel in the past few months has far surpassed the increase in material. We have three times as many ships in commission today as we had six months ago."

On October 6, 1917, the Government Committee on Public Information issued to the nation a statement saying: "The navy now has in service more than three times as many men and nearly three times as many vessels as when war was declared. The navy and Marine Corps constitute a force of more than a quarter of a million men. The Atlantic fleet comprises twice as many vessels as in peace times.

"The largest ship construction program in history is being carried out by the navy, comprising hundreds of vessels of various types from super-dreadnoughts to submarine chasers.

"The Shipping Board has under construction and contemplation a total tonnage of nearly 11,000,000 deadweight capacity, requiring a total authorization of about \$1,799,000,000."

require? Of course they would have to be brought in mass, for if brought in detachments these could easily be overcome before or after landing. Only a large army could hope to be able to disembark in safety and take secure possession of the country. How large an army can Japan transport across the Pacific? Let us see.

It happens that several times within the past few years the question has become acute in England, Can Germany invade Great Britain? and if so, with how many men? In order to answer these questions it was necessary for a careful inquiry to be made by the highest naval and military experts as to the adequacy of Germany's shipping, that is, as to the number of troops it would be possible for her to transport at one time across the North Sea. The results have been published and may be obtained by any one caring to take the trouble. Colonel H. B. Hanna in his book, *Can Germany Invade England?* gives the facts and figures with considerable fulness.

Germany possesses (or did possess before her war with Great Britain) the second largest merchant marine in the world—more than double the size of that of Japan. In answer to the claim that Germany could land in England six army

corps (246,000 men) Colonel Hanna says: "Germany has not sufficient shipping to convey 246,000 men, with all their *impedimenta*, and all their guns and horses and military carriage across the North Sea."¹ This judgment of Colonel Hanna is supported by the highest naval authorities of Great Britain.

In the British *Blue Book* of 1904 we are given the opinion of Major-General Sir John Ardagh, Director of Military Intelligence from 1896-1901, to the effect that 150,000 men is the largest force that either Germany or France can possibly transport across the North Sea at one time "from all its ports and with long preparation."

Still further. Admiral Sir Vesey Hamilton ridicules the idea that Germany can convey even one hundred thousand men across the North Sea, with all her shipping.²

In 1908 Lord Roberts made what is known as his famous "German scare speech," in which he claimed that Germany possessed suitable vessels sufficient to convey to England for invasion purposes two hundred thousand troops, giving the shipping figures on which he based his claim. At once the naval critics took him up and showed

¹ Hanna, p. 134.

² *Ibid.*, p. 48.

that he had made the number just twice too large, because he had allowed only half the space necessary per man on the transports. So that all he really claimed, when his estimate of space was corrected, was that it would be possible for Germany to find sufficient shipping to convey to England an army of one hundred thousand men, plus adequate munitions.¹

Under date of November 19, 1910, the British Admiralty, the highest naval authority in Europe, published a *Memorandum* on "England's Danger of Invasion," in which it declared that in its judgment the invasion of England by Germany, "even on the scale of seventy thousand men, is practically impossible."

So much for Germany. How about Great Britain? Great Britain has a merchant marine (or had previous to 1916) by far the largest in existence—much more than four times as great as Japan's. Yet Colonel G. A. Furse, in his *Military Expeditions beyond the Sea*, tells us that provision for suitable ships to transport even fifty-four thousand troops in one expedition, with the requisite artillery, ammunition, and other necessary *impedimenta*, would "tax all the energies of

¹ Hanna, p. 41.

the Transport Department of the British Admiralty."¹

And yet, in spite of such testimonials as these from the highest military and naval authorities in the world, we are glibly told that Japan, possessing a merchant marine which is only a fraction of that of either Germany or England, can suddenly, at any time she sees fit, leap across, not the little North Sea but the vast Pacific, and drop on our shores a great and fully munitioned army of a quarter or half million men.

How large an army would it really be possible for Japan to transport to America if she should requisition every ship in the empire capable of making a transoceanic voyage?

Mr. Richard Barry has given us in the *New York Times* (July 2, 1916) the estimates made by an American naval attaché at Tokyo (whose name he withholds) and Mr. Takuma Kuroda, whose large acquaintance with Japanese political, military, and naval affairs gives his judgment peculiar weight. The estimates arrived at by the two, one approaching the question from the standpoint of the American naval expert and the other from that of the Japanese public man with unusual

¹ Vol. i., pp. 207-209.

knowledge of the subject, essentially agreed. The conclusion reached by both was, that "Japan with the use of all her available ships might perhaps be able to bring over to America an army of thirty thousand men, certainly not more."

How different are the figures of men who have knowledge, from those of men whose only qualifications for speaking is their ignorance!

For the sake of getting a view from all sides, let us suppose Japan able to find shipping sufficient to dispatch from her shores even one hundred thousand men (three and one-third times larger than these experts deem possible—and larger than even Germany or England in their full marine strength could find transportation for at one time)—what then? Such a mass of troop ships and ammunition ships, together with its convoying naval fleet, would form an armada greater than ever sailed any sea. How could such a vast collection, such an enormous and unwieldy conglomeration of vessels, of every size and type, and of different rates of speed, be kept together on such a voyage? How could it be supplied with coal, since Japan has no colliers? What captain or admiral would dare to take command of it? What would become of it in case of a storm?

Even if the main American navy had been sunk, not all of our submarines would be likely to have been destroyed. What would become of this stupendous, unmanageable egg-shell flotilla, laden with human beings, if attacked by a dozen or fifty submarines? And what could save it if it were attacked, as it would be, by hundreds and thousands of armed and bomb-bearing airships, dropping upon it destruction from the skies? And finally, even if a miracle took place, and all the ships, or half of them, or a quarter, reached the American coast, how could they be able to go through the long, slow, difficult, and hazardous process of landing, in face of the forts and garrisons, and troops, and aeroplanes and submarines, and mines with which they would be confronted?¹

Ninth: If miracles on miracles happened, and

¹ Says Mr. Jiuji G. Kasai, author of *The Mastery of the Pacific*: "Suppose the Japanese fleet of Japan were able to overcome or successfully to evade the greatly superior American fleet, and reach the American coast, where could it land? The Golden Gate is well protected with mighty fortresses and with Mare Island navy yard in its vicinity, equipped with large docks and arsenals; Astoria, at the mouth of the Columbia River, is protected by mines and coast defences; the Juan de Fuca Strait and Puget Sound are strongly fortified, backed by the great naval base at Bremerton; while the entire coast is defended with the mobile artillery of recent invention. Under such a state of preparedness, how could the enemy land upon American territory?"

if Japan succeeded in landing an army of one hundred thousand men, and then if later she were able to double and treble and quadruple the number, what could she accomplish? Doubtless she could seize some territory, and if she so desired she could destroy considerable property. But how would that help her? Even if she were able to gain temporary possession of our entire Pacific Coast, it would avail her nothing so far as conquering the nation was concerned. It would simply entail upon her a stupendous expense in men and money, to no purpose and with no return.

Says Professor Roland G. Usher:

The strategical and geographical conditions of this country are such that a foreign army landing on our shores would occupy the ground it stood on and no more. The British discovered in the Revolutionary War that the occupation of New York, Boston and Philadelphia put them no nearer the military possession of the continent than they were before, and that marching through provinces was not subduing them.¹

In the present war in Europe, Germany very early conquered a larger proportion of France than the whole Pacific Coast would be of the United States; but did that mean the subjugation of the

¹ *Pan-Germanism*, pp. 140-141.

French nation? In 1915 Great Britain gained possession of an important section of the Gallipoli peninsula, and held it for several months; but she was finally compelled to abandon it with terrible losses. Napoleon in the height of his power seized Moscow, but it was his ruin.

The capture of San Francisco or Seattle or Los Angeles would prove the ruin of any invading army; it would arouse a nation, a hundred million strong, and fill them with a determination as relentless as death to drive the invader into the sea—an end which nothing could prevent.

The Pacific Coast is not the United States, but only a fringe on our western border. Even if Japan were able to seize it, the real nation, on the other side of fifteen hundred miles of mountains and barren plains, would be beyond her possible reach. Thus she would be simply held at bay, able to make no advance, piling up ruinous expenses, and all the while accomplishing nothing; while the real United States, untouched as yet, but roused to a white heat of passionate determination to drive out the invader, would gather and train her forces, and put in order her trans-continental railways, by means of which in due time she would pour simply overwhelming armies

of millions of men, equipped with every appliance of modern war, down upon the checkmated foe.

The result would be as certain as the law of gravitation. The baffled and overwhelmed invaders would have no possible resource except either to surrender on the soil, or to take flight in their ships, if they had any ships left. In either case the disaster to their nation would be the greatest in its history. For Japan to have any rational chance of conquering the United States she would be compelled to bring, not a petty one hundred thousand men, or five hundred thousand, but a million, two millions, five millions—and even then she could not succeed.

Tenth and finally: Japan could not possibly finance a war with us, if the war were to be of sufficient magnitude to amount to anything.

Without vast financial resources no nation can possibly succeed in a war with any strong power in our day. But, as we have seen, Japan is poor—by far the poorest of the first-class nations. To be sure her people are brave; but that is not enough. Bravery cannot take the place of those enormously expensive armaments and those mountains of munitions without which modern battles cannot be won. Doubtless she can defend herself and

protect her rights at home. She has a large and well-trained army and an efficient navy, probably ample in strength to repel any possible invaders from her shores. But she has no adequate financial resources with which to wage wars with strong distant nations.

In order to carry on her relatively inexpensive war with nearby Russia, in 1905, she was obliged to burden herself with a debt that is well-nigh crushing. Little of that debt is yet paid. Under the burden of it she must stagger for many years to come. To assume another load as great would ruin her. But a war of invasion carried on in distant America, in order to have any chance at all of success, would have to be many times over more expensive. Her war with Russia was short; this could accomplish nothing unless it were long. That, she was able to carry on at only a little distance from her base of supplies, while her antagonist was four thousand miles from his. In this, the situation would be reversed; here she would be compelled to do her fighting nearly six thousand miles from her base of supplies, while her foe would fight at home.

Not only does Japan not have the money necessary to carry on war with America, but she

could not borrow it. All the resources she possesses would not afford sufficient security on which to obtain one-half of the billions of money which she would require. She would be bankrupt before the great struggle had well begun. Moreover, even if she possessed the necessary security, in what direction could she hope to find the money? No nation of exhausted Europe has it. Her only possible resource would be America. O, the humour of the dream!—would she seek to borrow from us, her foe, financial resources with which to invade us, and for guaranty of pay, mortgage to us her Sunrise Empire?

As for the United States, her resources are practically inexhaustible. She is by far the richest of the nations. No other three, probably no other four, combined, could sustain the drain and strain of war so long as she alone. A war sufficiently vast and carried on sufficiently long to conquer this country (for it would have to be a war as terrible as that in Europe and continued for years) would require the financial resources, not of Japan, but of a third part of the world. And even then it would fail.

The task that confronts any nation that attempts, under modern conditions, to carry on a war

against a distant people, fighting in their own land in defence of "their homes, their altars, and their fires," is well illustrated by the war of Great Britain with the Boers of South Africa, in 1899-1902.

Great Britain, the richest nation in Europe, and one of the most powerful, possessing the largest merchant marine in the world and therefore having the best facilities of any nation for transporting troops and munitions of war, found it necessary to send to South Africa nearly two hundred and fifty thousand soldiers, to be at an expense of almost a billion dollars, and to carry on a struggle for more than two years and a half, in order to conquer a little nation of half a million Boer farmers.

In the light of these facts, how many soldiers may we suppose Japan would be compelled to send to America, how much money would she be obliged to spend, and how long a time would it take her to conquer the United States, a nation 170 times as populous as the Boer Republics, far more than 170 times as rich, and as distant from her shores as South Africa is from England?

Possibly a little light may also be obtained on the practicability of an invasion of America by Japan, by a study of our own experience in the Philippines.

We carried on a war in those islands with a people numbering eight million, virtually without a Government, extremely poor, having armies made up of raw recruits, almost wholly without artillery, provided in the main with only the very poorest of arms, indeed some of them fighting with bows and arrows. How long did it take us to conquer them? More than two years!

In view of this bit of history of our own, how long may we suppose it would take Japan to conquer a distant nation like the United States, which, in a year's time, if necessity arose, could put into the field five millions of men, and in two years ten millions, thoroughly trained, and provided with the most effective arms and the most deadly war appliances of every kind, that the modern world could create?

I do not wonder at the declaration of an eminent Japanese statesman, made in my presence in Tokyo, that "there is as much probability of Japan attempting an invasion of America as there is of the people of the planet Mars undertaking the same job, and no more."

CHAPTER IX

THE MENACE OF JAPAN IN CHINA

Is Japan's Attitude toward China Likely to Give Trouble to the United States?

THERE are two other sources of irritation and consequently of possible danger between the United States and Japan, besides the machinations of mischief makers and the scare-talk about an invasion.

One is the situation in China.

I do not regard the Chinese situation so far as it relates to the interests of this country, as by any means seriously critical. And yet it should be mentioned, because not a few persons among us have at times been apprehensive lest the policies of this country and of Japan in China might conflict and thus lead to trouble.

The matters over which collision has been feared are two. One is the "integrity" of China and the other is the "open door." When John

Hay was our Secretary of State he made it known in the Orient and among those nations of Europe which have the most intimate relations with the Orient, that we in this country desire and expect China on her part to keep open the doors of her commerce and trade equally to all nations; and that we also desire and expect all governments which have relations with China, on their part to respect her integrity—that is, to do nothing looking in the direction of dividing or appropriating her territory; and also to refrain from all action aiming to close the doors of her trade and commerce in any respect, or to interfere in any way with equality of opportunity for all nations in trade relations with her people.

Two or three years ago Japan made certain demands upon China which to the Chinese Government and to some persons in this country seemed severe—indeed, seemed both to threaten China's independence and also to interfere with the open-door principle. To these demands the Chinese Government strongly objected. Much discussion followed. Extensive negotiations were carried on between Pekin and Tokyo. America asked for fuller information.¹ At last the demands

¹ These demands were the work of the short-lived Okuma

were explained, the misunderstandings were corrected, the more objectionable demands were either modified or withdrawn, and unequivocal assurances were given by Japan that nothing in the demands was intended to interfere with China's rights as an independent nation, or to curtail the principle of equal freedom of trade in China by all nations. Indeed, we have many assurances from the most reliable sources, including the highest officials of the Japanese Government, that Japan does not seek territory or political control in China, and will do nothing to interfere with China's integrity or to disturb the policy of the "open door."

One of the best known of these assurances is the Anglo-Japanese Treaty of 1905, the second paragraph of whose preamble declares the Treaty to have for its object: "The preservation of the common interests of all the powers in China by insuring the independence and integrity of the

ministry. The better mind of Japan did not approve of them. As a result, the ministry of Count Okuma was overthrown. The present Premier, Count Terauchi, and his Cabinet, from the outset have taken the attitude not only of friendliness to China, but of scrupulous consideration for the feelings, sentiments, and desires of the Chinese people, carefully refraining so far as possible from everything that might even be interpreted as encroaching on their rights.

Chinese Empire and the principle of equal opportunity for the commerce and industry of all nations in China." Thus, as the *Outlook* comments, "The Treaty recognizes the policy of the open door as final and authoritative."

The Root-Takahira Agreement between Japan and this country (December, 1908) is equally explicit. Says Article 4 of that Agreement:

They [Japan and the United States] are determined to preserve the common interests of all powers in China, by supporting by all pacific means at their disposal the independence and integrity of China and the principle of equal opportunity for the commerce and industry of all nations in that Empire.

The assertion is made in some quarters that Japan, while nominally assenting to the open-door policy, as a fact is endeavouring to monopolize Chinese trade and shut out the United States.

Is there any foundation for this assertion?

Of course Japan desires to extend her trade in China. This is her right. China is her nearest foreign market, and a market of almost unlimited extent if only developed. She needs this market. Doubtless she will put forth vigorous and persist-

ent efforts to develop it. And why should she not? All we have a right to ask of her is that her competition with us there shall be honourable, as it has always been.

There seems to be no reason for believing that Japan desires to prevent investments of American capital in China. What she insists upon is simply that investments made by Americans, or citizens of any other country, ought to take such a form as not to endanger China's political independence and full control of every part of her own domain. This is important, because in the past several European powers, by means of loans and investments, have obtained franchises and concessions that have had the effect of robbing China of large areas of territory and bringing her, as regards certain important matters, into political subjection to those powers. This Japan believes to be in the highest degree dangerous to China, to herself, and to the entire Orient. To this she naturally and rightly objects. But as to investments of American capital in China in ways that will not interfere with her territorial integrity and political freedom, these Japan favours and even urges—urges them because whatever tends to increase the wealth and prosperity of China is

certain to benefit Japan, China's nearest neighbour and best customer.

As proof of this it is only necessary to cite the fact that in the winter of 1915-16 Baron Shibusawa, who is perhaps the most influential industrial and financial leader in Japan, made an extended visit to this country on purpose to call the attention of our chambers of commerce and our leading financiers and business men to the great openings that exist in China for American investments. China has enormous undeveloped resources, he pointed out. She has mines among the richest in the world, that are almost untouched. She has vast and numberless water powers that are unused. Her need of railroads, telegraphs, highways and bridges, manufactures, all the appliances and accompaniments of modern civilization, is almost limitless. Here is America's opportunity, with safety and profit to herself, to be of the highest possible service to a great people just struggling out of the limitations of the past into a larger life.

You in America [said in effect this distinguished financier] possess the capital that China requires; but she is distant from you, and you have little knowledge of Chinese conditions. On the other hand, we in Japan are near her; we have long been in close

contact with the Chinese people; our civilization is related to theirs; we know them as it is impossible for the people of another continent and another race to do. We have only limited capital, but we have men, men in great numbers, trained in finance, in business management and methods, in science, in engineering, in manufactures, in all those lines of knowledge, skill and enterprise that China requires for her development. Many of them are men trained in your own American universities. Let us join hands therefore; let us co-operate in this great field, in this great undertaking to give China the financial and industrial assistance that she needs. Let us do it not as charity or philanthropy, but as business, as honourable business, conducted with a view to the benefit of all concerned, America, Japan and China.

Such was essentially the message brought by Baron Shibusawa from the business men of Japan to the business men of America. The same message has come to us through other sources, and continues to come. Whether it is or is not a wise message, at least it is an honourable and a fraternal one, and one that should answer once for all the assertions of those who would have us believe that Japan is scheming to close the door of finance and business in China against the United States.¹

¹ The attitude toward China assumed by Count Terauchi, the present Premier, seems assuring. He has taken pains to make

As for the integrity of China, that in the past has been violated repeatedly, and with results of the most serious character. Who have been the violators? For the most part the nations of Europe. At least four of those nations—Great

clear to the world that Japan's desire is not for a weak but for a strong China. Said the editor of *East and West News* under date of December 28, 1916: "According to the news agency's recent reports, Count Terauchi and his Cabinet are resolved that Japan will not interfere with the internal affairs of China in any way; that she will co-operate with that country for the 'preservation of peace in the Far East'; that she will attempt to acquire no more rights in China, and will not hereafter urge the Pekin Government to employ Japanese advisers unless China really welcomes them for the development of the country."

Says Dr. Sawayanagi, a member of the House of Peers, in an article published in *Shin Nippon*, the magazine of ex-Premier Marquis Okuma: "Japan does not wish any territorial partition of China. The idea of such partition must be denounced most emphatically. If Japan gained a portion of China's territory, Britain, France, Russia and Germany would claim from China the same concession, and thus Japan's sphere of activity in China would be narrowed. If, on the contrary, Japan's activity in China be limited to economic, religious and other peaceful undertakings, the whole of China will be thrown open to Japan's activity. What China demands of Japan lies in a different direction. China is not yet equipped with all the organization requisite for an independent state. Her social organization must be made orderly. Her currency must be improved, her tax laws unified. She cannot do these things without external help. Japan is her nearest neighbour and most assured friend. The interests of the two nations are one."—*East and West News*, May 3, 1917.

Says Viscount Kaneko: "China is the place where Japanese and American business men can go hand in hand and effect benefits advantageous to both. The United States will get the

Britain, Russia, France, and Germany—have wrested from the Chinese people large areas, including strategic military and naval bases of great importance, and have laid plans threatening still further seizures. Of course Japan from the

larger proportion of this trade. We do not claim an equal proportion. The United States has larger plants, more abundant engineering, more skilled workmen. Let America get the larger proportion in China, we getting our reasonable share.

"America could supply capital, engineering talent and machinery which we cannot supply, but we can supply some material and some workmen, and then we could work hand in hand. I think the Chinese market will witness co-operation between Japan and the United States within a few years, and I hope the co-operation will be advantageous to both nations and to the people of China."—*East and West News*, January 25, 1917.

Mr. Gilbert Bowles, secretary and director of the Japanese Language School of Tokyo and Secretary of the American Peace Society of Japan, who for many years has been a close student of Japan's foreign policy, bears strong testimony to the friendly feeling and intentions of Japan toward both China and the United States. He writes in the *American Advocate of Peace* of December, 1916: "Japan's declared policy regarding Chinese matters is in complete harmony with America's. This is attested by the fact that every treaty obligation into which Japan has entered is pledged to maintain the open door and non-partition of China. The open door in China will give Japan all she wants. She will benefit more than any other country by the modernization of China; her opportunities will be as great as she can possibly use, and this will be because of her natural advantages, about which no one can quarrel with her. In China the interests of Japan and America are not in collision, and cannot come in collision, so long as Japan's treaty obligations remain what they are today. Japanese statesmen are too well acquainted with the realities of the situation to dream of attacking America because of any question existing between the two nations."

beginning has recognized in all this a peril to herself and to the whole Orient. If China were destroyed as an independent nation by being apportioned among the powers of Europe, nothing in the Orient would be safe. Even Japan herself would have to fight for her life, and would be fortunate if she could preserve it. Indeed it could hardly be more than a question of time when all Asia would become subject to Europe, as two-thirds of it already is.

These facts and considerations should help us to see how greatly to the interest of Japan it is that China's integrity shall be preserved inviolate, and that the Chinese nation shall become prosperous and strong. In the very nature of the case any signs of weakness on the part of China's Government causes anxiety in Japan; for a helpless China, ready to fall an easy prey to the nations which have despoiled her in the past, renders Japan's own future insecure.

Is it strange, if the facts that Japan is situated near to China, that their interests are closely related, that her government is well established and strong while that of China is as yet somewhat insecure, and above all that she possesses large military and naval strength while China has

comparatively little—is it strange if these facts cause Japan to feel a degree of responsibility for and to China, and a desire to lend her a helping hand if she may?

Nothing is more clear than that the future destiny of Japan is largely bound up with that of China, and the future of China with that of Japan. The two nations must stand together as friends, or else, in the words of Dr. Gulick,

come under the heavy hand of a united European domination. It is impossible to conceive of Japanese expulsion of European powers from China, except with the cordial co-operation of China herself. If Japan does not win and keep the friendship of China, then Japan herself is ruined, for China and Europe combined can crush Japan.

Fortunately, the indications are, as we have already seen, that the future policy of Japan is likely to be one of steadily increasing amity and co-operation with her great neighbour. In that case neither need fear.

Is it strange if Japan feels that there is a necessity for a sort of "Monroe Doctrine" of the Orient, and that, because she at present is the only strong power in that part of the world, therefore that the obligation rests upon her to become the guardian

of such a doctrine in the Orient, in some such way as the United States has been the guardian of the Monroe Doctrine in America?

In the words of Mr. David Lawrence: "Japan wants a leadership in the Far East analogous to that of the United States in the Western Hemisphere." Why should she not have it, if only she will employ that leadership unselfishly, justly, generously? Says Mr. Lawrence:

We on our part have put ourselves on record as desiring no territory or even commercial preference in Central and South America. We stand in relation to the republics to the south of us in the same position that we gladly would have Japan stand toward China. We decline to take for ourselves anything which we would not gladly let other nations share with us. Japan has announced many a time that she does not want any "third power" to obtain Chinese territory. Will she explicitly include herself in that pledge and thereby guarantee for all time the territorial integrity and administrative independence of her own nearest neighbour? That would be a true Monroe Doctrine, and America would heartily welcome the application of its great principle by Japan to the Far East.¹

In all fairness, why is not a Monroe Doctrine of the East as important and as justifiable as a Monroe Doctrine on the American Continent?

¹ *New York Evening Post*, June 30, 1917.

And under the conditions which now exist and which are likely to exist for an indefinite future, why is it not both fitting and imperative for Japan to have it in charge? If Japan scrupulously respects the sentiments and the rights of the Chinese people and if she refrains from interfering in any way with their independence as a nation, whether in home or foreign affairs, as the United States avoids interfering with the independence, the rights, and the sentiments of the nations of America, then surely a Monroe Doctrine of the Orient, and Japan's guardianship of the same, ought to prove of great protective value to China, and therefore, it would seem, ought to be welcome to both China and the United States.

The above was written before the coming to this country of the special commission headed by Viscount Ishii. If there existed previously any doubt in the mind of any as to Japan's attitude toward China the grounds for such doubt have now been removed. Said Viscount Ishii at the Mayor's Banquet in New York (October 2, 1917):

At no time in the past and at no time in the future did we or will we seek to take territory from China, or to despoil China of her rights. We wish to be and always to continue to be, the sincere friend and helper

of our neighbour, for we are more interested than any one else except China herself in good government there; only we must at all times, for self-protection, prevent other nations from doing what we have no right to do. Not only will we not seek to assail the integrity or sovereignty of China, but we will eventually be prepared to defend and maintain the same integrity and independence of China against any aggressor.

Commenting on this clear, strong, unequivocal, and authoritative utterance, the *New York Times* well said:

Viscount Ishii's frank and candid statement of Japan's policy toward China should remove any doubt or anxiety which misunderstanding or misrepresentation may have caused. We are heartily in accord with Ishii in this policy.¹

¹ It only remains to be added, that on November 2, a definite and binding Agreement was entered into between this country and Japan, embodying exactly the pledges regarding China which were made by Viscount Ishii in his New York address, quoted above. This authoritative Agreement was signed on the part of Japan by Viscount Ishii, as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and on the part of the United States by Robert Lansing, Secretary of State. The Agreement was given out to the public by Secretary Lansing on November 6, 1917.

CHAPTER X

THE MENACE OF JAPAN IN CALIFORNIA

*Are the Japanese in California a Local Danger?
Are They a National Danger?*

A SECOND source of irritation between this country and Japan, and therefore, of possible danger, is the situation in California.

This may prove serious, very serious. However, it ought not to do so, and it will not, if we as a nation, including the people of California, are wise, courteous and just in our dealings with the Japanese Government, and with the few thousands of Japanese immigrants who have sought a home on our shores.

The treatment of Japan by the United States Government, as a government, has generally been honourable and fair. I think we have never had a President and never a Secretary of State (unless we except Mr. Knox—in his contention regarding the Manchurian railways), who can be charged

with failure in courtesy or justice in his dealings with the Japanese Government or with the Japanese people resident in this country. The trouble has been with individuals among us, with Congress in some degree, and with several of our Western States, particularly the one already named. Let us try to understand the California situation. There is much misapprehension concerning it.

The impression seems to be widespread that Japanese immigration on our Pacific Coast is really a menace—that so many Japanese labourers are coming, or seeking to come, as to crowd out our own people and to endanger our American institutions.

What are the exact facts?

There was at one time some real justification for the California people fearing an influx of objectionable Japanese. Before the Hawaiian Islands became a part of the United States, American planters there had brought to the islands large numbers of Japanese as contract labourers, virtually as slaves, who worked for very low wages and under conditions about as bad as can be conceived, conditions under which they became seriously degraded and brutalized. Soon after the islands were annexed by us in 1898 some

thousands of these undesirable labourers took advantage of the opportunity thus opened to them to migrate to our Pacific Coast States, principally to California. The sudden influx and the general low character of these immigrants not unnaturally alarmed the California people. As a result an anti-Japanese agitation began.

If conditions had remained permanently as they were at first, there would have been some ground for a continuance of the agitation to the present time. But conditions did not remain as they were in the beginning. In the first place, there was soon a marked change in the general character of the Japanese that came. The earlier immigrants who had been contract labourers on Hawaiian plantations, and who had been brutalized by years of shocking treatment by their employers there, did not truly represent the labouring men of Japan; but the fact that they came first created a prejudice against the Japanese people generally, which it was hard to eradicate. As a matter of fact, those early immigrants from Hawaii themselves began greatly to improve as soon as they had escaped from the degrading conditions of their contract serfdom in the islands and had been permitted to enter upon free lives

under the better conditions which they found in California. What was still more important, the later Japanese immigrants who came mainly from Japan direct, and had been subjected to no such deteriorating influences as those of the Hawaiian plantations, were and are of a distinctly superior class. If these men, who were and are the true representatives of Japanese labour, had reached California first, it would have been much more difficult to stir up an anti-Japanese agitation. This changed and improved character of the Japanese labourers in California, and the fact that if labourers shall come in the future they will be of this better class, should be understood if we would see the situation in California as it really is.

Still another thing it is equally important for us to understand. It is that the immigration of Japanese labour into California virtually ceased nearly ten years ago, so that it is not a present issue, but only one of the past. And it is instructive to note that this immigration was stopped, not by the State of California, nor by the United States Government, but by Japan. In view of the fact that political and labour agitators in California, largely or wholly for selfish ends, had stirred

up prejudice against the Japanese, representing their presence as a menace, and demanding various forms of humiliating legislation against them, the Japanese Government, to do what it could to avoid friction between the two countries, in the year 1907, entered into an arrangement with the Government of the United States—not a treaty but what is known as a “Gentleman’s Agreement,”—promising, of its own motion, to issue no more passports permitting Japanese labouring men to leave Japan for the purpose of entering the United States. This “Gentleman’s Agreement” the Japanese Government has strictly kept, and proposes to keep. Thus we see how entirely without foundation is the idea that Japan desires to force her people on us, against our will, or that California or any other part of the United States is in danger of an overplus of Japanese labourers.

There has been, since the Gentleman’s Agreement went into effect, some return from Japan of labourers who had gone there temporarily, after having previously resided in this country; this the Agreement permitted. There have also entered this country considerable numbers of non-labourers—students who have come to study in our universities, travellers, merchants, and wives and

children of Japanese men residing here. For all these the Agreement made provision. But the class of persons of whom the California people complained, and whom they desired to have shut out, namely the Japanese labouring class, have been and are shut out effectually by the Gentleman's Agreement, with the exception, of course, of those who were already residents of California when the Agreement was entered into. This means that the Japanese of the labouring class in California are decreasing in number, and have been ever since the Agreement went into force. The same is true of the country as a whole. In the seven years following the Agreement, 15,139 more Japanese men (mostly labourers) left the United States than entered.

How many Japanese are there now in California?

According to the latest authorities, the number is somewhere between fifty-five thousand and sixty thousand. Consul-General Yamazaki, of San Francisco, reporting on the census of Japanese in California undertaken in 1916 by the Japanese Chamber of Commerce, gives the number as sixty thousand. Professor H. A. Millis, as the result of a careful investigation made in 1914-15, and published in his book, *The Japanese Problem*

in California, decides upon fifty-five thousand. Suppose we take the larger number; what proportion would that be of the whole population of the State, which in 1910 was 2,377,549, but which is believed to be now not less than 2,750,000? It would give us one Japanese to every forty-six other persons, or a Japanese population of about two per cent. of the whole—a proportion so strangely small compared with the number of foreigners of other nationalities (Irish, Germans, Scandinavians, Italians, *et al.*) found in some of our States, that we wonder how anybody can think of it as a “peril.”¹

¹ According to estimates made by the Japanese Foreign Office, Tokyo, in 1915, the total number of Japanese in the entire Western Hemisphere, in Alaska, Canada, the United States, Mexico, Central America, and South America, all combined, is (or was two years ago) 201,110. This is fewer than the number of immigrants that have come into the United States in a single year from a single European country. In 1851 we admitted 221,253 immigrants from Ireland, and in the years 1881 and 1882 we received 210,484 and 250,630, respectively, from Germany.

CHAPTER XI

THE MENACE OF JAPAN IN CALIFORNIA (Continued)

*Are the Japanese in California a Local Danger?
Are They a National Danger?*

NOTWITHSTANDING the facts that the Japanese labourers in California are relatively so few, and that they are not increasing in number, are they not, for various reasons, an undesirable and dangerous class? and are not the "white" people of the State justified in discriminating against them and desiring to get rid of them?

Let us see what are some of the principal complaints made concerning them.

Are they not an illiterate class, whose ignorance is a peril and whose presence lowers the general intelligence of the State?

The answer is: There are illiterates among them, but they are very few. Their proportion to the whole number is much less than among Italians and other European immigrants who are warmly

welcomed in California and in every other American State.

Do not the Japanese keep their own language and neglect or refuse to learn English, and thus remain a permanently alien and unassimilated element in the communities where they live?

Mr. John D. Mackenzie, Commissioner of Labour Statistics of California, who at the direction of the Legislature conducted a special investigation into conditions among the Japanese of the State, reported, as one of the surprises of the investigation, the fact that almost every Japanese, whether farmer or farmhand, was found to have in his possession English-Japanese dictionaries and conversation books; which of course showed not only their literacy in their native tongue but their eagerness to learn English. Many of them were found to be subscribers to local English papers, while their favourite magazines were not fiction magazines, but such substantial publications as the *Outlook*, *The Independent*, *The Review of Reviews*, and *The Literary Digest*. Says another investigator: "The Japanese of California are as steady in the pursuit of knowledge as they are industrious as tillers of the soil."¹

¹ See *Asia at the Door*, by K. K. Kawakami, pp. 137-138.

Do not Japanese labourers work for lower wages than others, and therefore do they not force down the wages of American and European labourers below the living point?

Emphatically, no. This is the answer given both by the California Commission of 1909 appointed to investigate this among other matters, and also by the United States Immigration Commission. The same answer is given by Professor H. A. Millis, in his book, *The Japanese Problem in the United States*, who tells us that in every instance in which recent data have been obtained it is found that Japanese and European immigrants are paid at the same rate.

Do not the Japanese in California live in the poorest class of houses, in conditions of squalor, without proper cleanliness or sanitation, and therefore do they not prove themselves very undesirable neighbours and citizens?

The answer is: To those early immigrants from Hawaii, already mentioned, who were very poor, and who had suffered great hardships as contract labourers, almost slaves, objections of this kind might with some justice have been made. Also in connection with some individual later comers, from both Hawaii and from Japan, there has been

ground for such objections. But this condition of things has almost wholly passed by.

In their own country the Japanese, even the poorest classes, are among the cleanliest people in the world, both in their personal habits and in their homes. As already stated, personal bathing at least once a day is universal, and when one enters a home he always puts off his shoes.

As to sanitation, an authority who has investigated the matter in all parts of the United States says:

The Japanese quarter in any American city is as sanitary and clean as any foreign district, if not much more so. Sanitary officers admit that, compared with the houses occupied by immigrants of some other races, those of the Japanese are in far better condition. True, some of the Japanese lodging houses may be found somewhat crowded, but none are so crowded as lodging houses of other immigrants. In the matter of sanitation the Japanese everywhere make a good showing.

Of course when Japanese immigrants, who happen to be very poor, begin their life in this country, like other very poor people, they have to content themselves with very simple and plain quarters, in localities where rents are lowest. Their home furnishings must be of the cheapest

and their living the most inexpensive. This is the way they begin. But they are industrious and saving and ambitious to rise, and no class of immigrants sooner put off all traces of extreme poverty or squalor and provide themselves with comfortable conditions of life, and with attractive clothes, than the Japanese. Indeed, one of the faults found with them by a certain class of critics, is that they dress too well, pay too much attention to personal appearance, and are too courteous and polite.

It must be admitted that many Japanese farmers, like their compatriots in the cities,

are not yet in a position to cultivate refined tastes. Their dwellings are not yet what they can be proud of. But no Japanese will admit that this is to be their ultimate condition. So far from it, they are ambitious not only to acquire wealth but to elevate their social standing.

It has been contended that when a Japanese settles on a farm it always results in the lowering of price of the adjoining farms, because farmers do not desire to live in his neighbourhood.

Facts do not countenance such contentions. In the first place, the Japanese have in most cases settled or worked on undeveloped lands, whose fertility was

problematical and whose price was naturally very low. They clear such lands and convert them into highly productive farms.

For example, the land about Fresno is sandy, and was long regarded as unproductive. The Japanese were induced to come, and the country soon became rich with grapes, raisins and wines. It is to the Japanese that Fresno is indebted for its general prosperity and for the high price that its farm land now commands.

At Florin, not far from Sacramento, it was also the Japanese who utilized the poorest lands and converted them into profitable strawberry gardens.

In the Sacramento valley the lowlands are damp and unhealthy, and in consequence remained long undeveloped. Again the Japanese were brought in, and the region now flows with milk and honey.

In Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and in almost every State where the Japanese engage in agriculture, it is the same story.¹

Miss Alice M. Brown, of Florin, writes in *Collier's Weekly*:

Adjoining my home is eighty acres which for all these years had never been touched by a plough—so sloughy and shallow was the land that the white men set it aside as fit only for a pasture. The Japanese turned it into the most beautiful vineyard and strawberry patches, and where the poorest of the poor soil lay is the finest berry patch in this vicinity. Neat

¹ *Asia at the Door*, by K. K. Kawakami, pp. 107-108.

little homes dot that once barren tract, and are occupied by as good and kindly neighbours (Japanese) as one could ever wish to have.

Perhaps the complaint made oftenest against the Japanese in California previous to the passage of the anti-Japanese land law in 1913 (the law prohibiting the Japanese from acquiring title to land or real property), and indeed, the complaint chiefly instrumental in causing the enactment of that law, was that they (the Japanese) were getting possession of a dangerously large quantity of land, and thus were "crowding out" the "white" population of the State. The popular cry was: "They are taking our farms."¹

¹ We are not unfrequently told that the Japanese have no right to ask the United States to allow them to own any land here, because Americans are not permitted to own land in Japan. This reasoning would not be fair even if the statement regarding land-owning in Japan were true—as it is not. For Japan is a full and over-full country, which does not and can not invite immigrants from other nations; so that, even if it refused to sell land to foreigners it would be abundantly justified because it has not enough for its own people. On the other hand, we have vast areas of land that are not in use. We invite immigrants freely from foreign countries; and to nearly all of them we sell land without any restriction or question. But to the Japanese we say: "No! you are an exception; we will sell land to the rest, but not to you." This discrimination against the Japanese is what wounds his feelings. And is it any wonder? Let us imagine the Japanese Government selling land to people of other

As a fact how much "crowding out" are the Japanese in California actually doing? How much land have they possession of?

According to the Year Book published by the *Japanese American* of San Francisco, in the year 1912, they owned in the State 31,814 acres, and leased 225,046 acres. The total area of California is 101,351,000 acres. This means that one acre out of every 3185 was owned by them and one out of every 450 was leased by them.

Do these figures indicate that the Japanese were driving out the white population and getting possession of the State? I will not venture to answer this question myself, but will give the reply made by a California editor of the time. This editor, who had the advantage of living on the spot, declared emphatically and with fine scorn of any one who thought to the contrary, that the figures meant peril, peril awful and imminent. To prove his contention he per-

nations but refusing to sell to Americans; would we not feel the discrimination as an insult? As a fact, notwithstanding her very limited area, Japan passed a law in 1910 allowing the sale of land to any foreigner whose country reciprocates by granting the privilege of land purchase to Japanese. If then the inhabitants of any American State cannot buy land in Japan it is only because their State refuses to grant the same privilege to persons born in Japan.

formed the arduous but patriotic duty of estimating the exact time it would take for the Japanese to become masters of the entire State and crowd out all Americans and Europeans. I quote his words:

The statistics recently gathered show the dread extent of the Japanese invasion of the Pacific Coast. Their insidious, silent and secret advance into this country has long been going on. At the rate at which they have been grabbing land in California for the past ten years, they will actually obtain possession of the entire State in 84,450 years and a few months. Thus it is plain to the dullest comprehension that the peril is imminent. Unless the people rouse themselves without delay this swift advance will mean the destruction of the country within less than 844 centuries! In view of this startling condition of things, there is only one thing to be done. We must enact at once, without a day's postponement, the most drastic laws, either to drive the Japanese, every mother's son of them, out of the country, bag and baggage, or else absolutely to prohibit them from even owning or leasing another acre or another inch of California's sacred soil.

Well, the State "protected" itself by prohibiting them from owning any more land!

I have introduced this fine bit of Pacific Coast humour (or sarcasm) because it throws so much light upon the situation. And now let me say

for myself and in earnest, that what California really needed then and what she needs now, was not and is not the prevention of industrious Japanese from obtaining small areas of land, here and there,¹ many of them of the poorest quality, and by their intelligence and industry turning them into perfect gardens of productiveness, thus benefiting the whole State; but her real need was, and is, the infinitely more important prevention of rich American and English land-sharks from seizing whole townships and whole counties, and holding them, largely out of use, for purely speculative purposes. The fact is, single land companies and single individual speculators hold in their possession, for ends of the most selfish character, and hostile to the interests of the public, larger amounts of California soil than the combined area of all the land owned and all the land leased by all the Japanese in the State. These great land monopolists and land speculators are California's real foes—these and not the small

¹ There are a few cases of Japanese carrying on agricultural or horticultural operations on a large scale, as, for example, that of George Shima, the "Potato King"; but the great majority are in financial condition to own or lease only small areas, which they cultivate intensively and thus soon raise to a high degree of fertility.

farmers, the hard-working market gardeners and the skilful orchardists, who, though born in Japan, are loyal to California, and are doing so much to make her waste places to bud and blossom as the rose.

CHAPTER XII

THE MENACE OF JAPAN IN CALIFORNIA (Continued)

Are the Japanese in California a Local Danger? Are They a National Danger?

IN the session of 1913 of the Legislature of California no less than thirty-four bills were introduced, all aiming at limiting the rights or privileges of the Japanese, many of which rights and privileges were, in the judgment of high legal authorities, either clearly or inferentially guaranteed to them by treaty between the United States and Japan.¹

¹ These thirty-four bills—fourteen in the Senate and twenty in the House—classified by their respective natures, fell under the following seven heads:

1. Bills prohibiting Japanese from acquiring title to land or real property.
2. Bills increasing the license fee of Japanese fishermen from \$10 to \$100 a year.
3. Bills providing for the segregation of Japanese school children.
4. Bills forbidding the issuance of liquor licenses to Japanese.
5. Bills prohibiting Japanese from employing white women in any form of service.

How is this attitude of hostility to be accounted for? I have lived in California and thus have some personal knowledge of the State, and I am convinced that it does not truly represent a majority of the California people, certainly not the great body of the more intelligent, influential, and responsible.

I am convinced that most or all of the anti-Japanese agitation has been artificially worked up by a comparatively small minority of the people, for selfish ends—ends partly social, partly

6. Bills forbidding the Japanese to use power engines.

7. Bills placing a special poll tax upon the Japanese.

It is true that in most cases these bills did not openly attack the Japanese by using the Japanese name. Generally the indirect phrase "aliens not eligible to citizenship" was employed; but the attack was just as real, and the discrimination act just as galling and just as humiliating.

While these bills were before the Legislature the friends of the Japanese tried in vain to get adequate hearings, while every enemy and every reviler of them was given abundant time. During the debate in the Senate, Senator Wright arose and declared: "You are all playing politics, dirty, cheap politics; you all know you are, and you don't dare deny it." The San Francisco *Argonaut* said of the land bill: "It is just a bit of cheap political buncombe, meaningless and ineffective in itself, useful only in that it may help somebody to get votes under pretense of being a Japanese baiter." For a full and candid description of the way in which the campaign against the Japanese was carried on in the Legislature, see Mr. K. K. Kawakami's *Asia at the Door*, Chapter IX.

economic, but largely political. There are few examples in American history of more blind, partisan, unscrupulous legislation than that against the Japanese in 1913. The best people of the State tried to prevent it, seeing how unjust it was to the Japanese, and how injurious it would be certain to prove to the commonwealth. President Wilson tried to prevent it, and went so far as to send his Secretary of State, Mr. Bryan, to California, to expostulate with the Legislature, and to point out to them how seriously it would interfere with the diplomatic relations between the national government and Japan. It was almost universally condemned throughout the country. Says Mr. Kawakami, the distinguished Japanese writer:

Seldom during my thirteen years' residence in the United States have I seen the true greatness of the American nation so vividly demonstrated as on the occasion of the land legislation in California. The majority of American newspapers and of fair-minded Americans turned a solid phalanx to the California legislators and denounced their selfishness and bigotry. Would that the Japanese on the other side of the Pacific could have seen this imposing spectacle!"

Perhaps no one has given a better description of the political conditions in California which

have made the anti-Japanese legislation possible than the Rev. Benjamin Fay Mills. Two years ago, after a residence of sixteen years in the State, Mr. Mills said:

The antipathy felt in California toward the Japanese would be obliterated in a single day if the organized trades would admit them to their unions.

The proposition to pass laws discriminating against the Japanese is due to our party system of government. There is a sufficiently strong minority in California who have anti-Asiatic prejudices to cause all political parties to bid for their votes; this minority, organized in the unions and among the small farmers, is able to make itself felt in legislation. The anti-Japanese legislation enacted by the influence of this organized anti-Japanese minority, if it were submitted to a referendum vote of the people of the State, would be voted down.

The Japanese problem in California is due to the intense bigotry of a certain class. It indicates a state of evolution. The California people are among the noblest and most generous in the world. In regard to most things they are anything but narrow or bigoted or unjust. This regrettable prejudice against the Japanese entertained by a portion of the population does not represent the State as a whole, or the most intelligent minds of the State. It cannot last. We in California need what the Japanese can contribute to us, and they need what we can contribute to them. It is simply a case calling for a better

understanding of each nation by the other, for large-mindedness and for vast patience.¹

It should be understood once for all that the question at issue between Japan and this country is not that of the admission of more Japanese immigrants to our shores (the Japanese Government does not ask for more admissions); it is that of "safe-guarding the rights and privileges of the Japanese who are already lawfully here."

"The whole trouble is our discriminatory legislation"; our legislation which treats the Japanese as an inferior class; which denies to them privileges and rights which are freely granted to other foreign-born persons who have taken up their residence among us.²

¹ Address before the Twentieth Century Club, Boston.

² We are often told that on account of her large and growing population Japan seeks, and must seek, an opportunity to overflow into America. The facts are, she has much less need of a chance to overflow in any direction than many suppose. If she can develop her manufactures and her foreign trade to anything like the extent that she hopes, she will be able easily to support her people for a long time to come. Furthermore, the direction in which she desires expansion, and is urging such of her people to migrate as desire to leave the home land, is not far-away America, but near-by Formosa, Korea, Manchuria and Mongolia, where the people are more nearly related to her own, where conditions are more nearly like those of Japan, where there are vast undeveloped resources of land and mines, and where her migrants would not be lost to her as would be the case if they came to this country.

The position of Japan has been clearly stated by Baron Shibusawa. Says that distinguished representative of Japan:

The only question outstanding between Japan and America is the status of Japanese who have been lawfully admitted into the country. The question of Japanese immigration is no longer under consideration; that question was disposed of several years ago by the formation of the so-called "Gentleman's Agreement." The stipulations of that compact are being rigidly enforced by the Japanese Imperial Government, so that no labourer is under any circumstances allowed to leave Japan for America. Naturally the Japanese people do not like being denied entrance into the United States, while all races from Europe are welcomed with open arms. But the honour of Japan has been pledged under a solemn agreement and no patriotic Japanese ever dreams of breaking his plighted word. Even the Japanese jingo press does not demand free admission to America of our labour immigration. So that question has been definitely gotten out of the way, and the only cause of complaint on our part is the discriminatory legislation against Japanese who have already been admitted into the American Republic.

Japan has attained a recognized place among the first-class nations of the world. Her civilization is essentially on a level with our own. Is it strange therefore that she chafes at finding us

treating her people in ways in which we would not think of treating Englishmen or Frenchmen or Italians, or Poles or Portuguese, or even Icelanders or immigrants from the most backward Balkan states, or from Turkey? We ought to honour her for the self-respecting stand that she takes. We ought to be ashamed to be willing for a moment to consent to any treatment of her people that is of a nature to wound or humiliate either them or her.

In 1916, when the Burnett Immigration Bill, proposing racial discrimination against the Japanese, was before Congress, the Japanese Government sent to our Government a respectful but very earnest protest. The grounds of the protest were that Japan is not willing to have any legislation enacted by the United States which will discriminate against the Japanese as an inferior people, that is, which will virtually say to the world, that we regard them as unworthy of certain rights and privileges which we grant to other nations. The Japanese feel that such legislation would be a violation of our treaties, which guarantee to them equality of treatment with other nations. They also feel that it would put a stigma upon them which no nation ought to be

willing to put upon another. Japan is willing to let her "Gentleman's Agreement" stand, in which she promises of her own free will to prevent (and does prevent) her labourers from coming to this country. That involves no national humiliation on her part. But to have the Agreement enacted into law by our Government, and thus to have her labourers, no matter how intelligent and superior, forbidden entrance, while labourers from every European country, little matter how ignorant or undesirable, are freely welcomed, this would be felt by her to be humiliating in a very high degree. And the sting of it would be peculiarly keen because coming from the United States, whose justice and fairness she has always trusted and whose friendship she has always so highly prized.

In the words of Mr. Chugo Chira, of the *East and West News Bureau* :

While Japan might voluntarily enter into an agreement to prevent immigration to America (as she actually has done) without sacrificing her honour, she might not see her way clear to quiet acceptance of a law aimed directly at her, proclaiming the inferiority of her people. This is touching the Japanese nation in its tenderest spot. Ever since Japan became a factor in civilization she has struggled to gain

admission to the family of nations as their equal. This has been her ambition: she believes it an honourable one. She has now reached a stage where, without disturbing other nations, she believes she may ask her equality to be recognized. And now the American Congress proposes to exclude her citizens from this country by law. I am very much afraid that this evidence of what will be considered by Japanese as America's contempt for them, will have an unhappy result.

On the same subject, Count Okuma, at that time Premier of Japan, is quoted (*New York Times*, June 18, 1916) as uttering the following candid and friendly but very earnest words:

No one among us is satisfied with the attitude of racial discrimination against us in the United States. We believe that we are not foolishly sentimental about it, but we are not content. If you ask me what we want, then I must say frankly, that we want equal treatment with the European nations. We want to see the United States do the fair and just thing; and to do it not under pressure, but of its own free accord. And we cannot but believe that by and by America will come to understand us, and will cease to uphold an anti-Japanese prejudice.

How is it possible for any fair-minded American to deny that the Japanese are right in their feeling? We ought to honour them for their

unwillingness to be discriminated against, to be branded before the world as an inferior people. We ought to be ashamed to desire to put such an indignity upon any honourable, friendly nation.

The hostile treatment accorded to the Japanese in California and, to some extent, in other Pacific Coast States, does harm in several ways.

1. It fosters a bitter feeling among the people of those States. Certain numbers of Japanese are already there, even if the numbers are small. They have been legally admitted; they are engaged in various kinds of honest, productive business and labour; they have a right to stay; nobody seriously proposes to drive them out. It is a pity to have prejudices and ill feelings stirred up between them and their American neighbours, by the side of whom they must live and with whom they must do business and in many ways associate. They want to be friendly. It is infinitely better for the "white" people to meet them everywhere in a friendly spirit.

2. Hostile treatment carried to the extent of barring out Japanese immigration strikes a blow at the industrial development of these States. All the States have vast areas of land and vast resources, mining and other, which are unde-

veloped. All greatly need labour. All are seeking it through immigration. Why the folly of voluntarily cutting off a class of immigrants that are among the most intelligent, industrious, trustworthy, law-abiding, and economically valuable that are available for this country? Of course for the safety of our institutions all immigration should be guarded. No more immigrants from any foreign country should be admitted than we can assimilate and transform into real Americans. This applies to immigrants from Europe as well as to those from Asia. But having guarded carefully against going beyond certain reasonable limitations, why should not all our States which are eagerly welcoming immigrants from other directions, some of them distinctly less desirable, also welcome immigrants from Japan?

3. All treatment of the Japanese in California or in any other State, that is felt by them or by the Japanese Government to be prejudiced, unfair, unjust, or humiliating, tends to create estrangement between two nations that are neighbours, that must remain neighbours, and that ought to be fast friends. This is a serious matter, which no one of our States in framing its laws or shaping its policies should ever allow itself to forget.

Every State is a part of the larger nation. Its interests are bound up with those of the nation. If ever it permits itself to engage in any act or to pursue any policy which tends to tarnish the nation's good name or to imperil its peace, it does not only a short-sighted but a distinctly disloyal and dangerous thing.

CHAPTER XIII

THE SOLUTION OF THE JAPANESE QUESTION IN CALIFORNIA

I. National Control of Immigration

II. A New and Better Immigration Law

WHAT is necessary in order to heal the sores that have been created by our treatment of the Japanese in California (and in several other States), and to build up mutual good feeling and confidence between Japan and this country?

Before answering this question let me speak a word of hope. The situation does not seem to be growing worse. Indeed, there are distinct signs that it is beginning to grow better. Of course the fact that Japan is now our ally in war tends strongly to create a friendly feeling toward her as a nation. But before she entered the war a change was beginning to be manifest. For two or three years there have been growing indications that in California the old antagonisms are soften-

ing, and that many persons are beginning to look with favour upon the Japanese who formerly did not. It seems practically certain that the anti-Japanese legislation of 1913 could not now be enacted.

What is especially encouraging is that a better feeling is springing up between Japanese and native labour. In the summer of 1915 two representatives came from Japan to California to attend the state and national meetings of the American Federation of Labour. They visited the leading cities of the State and spoke at the Central Labour Councils, making everywhere an excellent impression. It was a remarkable event, which opened the eyes of the labour organizations to the fact that the interests of labour are one; that California has more than enough work for all; that native and Japanese labourers only injure themselves and the State by fighting each other; that what is needed by all is good feeling, fair play, and co-operation. In the autumn of 1916, at the meeting of the California State Federation of Labour, several resolutions were presented by local unions actually asking permission to accept Japanese members in their unions.

There are other indications of increasing good

feeling between the two races. A Japanese instructor in a public institution in California writes in a private letter:

Yes, we are getting along here much better than we used to. It is a long time since the boys have thrown stones at us. A striking change has become evident in our opportunities at the public tennis courts. Four or five years ago we had no chance at all if Americans wanted to play. But now we get a fair chance with the rest. It's fine.

In all parts of the State the Japanese have been showing their American spirit and their loyalty to the nation by their ready and even eager investments in Liberty Loan Bonds and by their really remarkably generous gifts to the Red Cross. Since our declaration of war with Germany, the English-speaking Japanese of the State have organized and equipped a regiment of trained volunteers which they have offered to the Government to serve patriotically and loyally under the United States flag wherever sent.

These facts, and others similar which might be given, would seem to be a clear sign that a new era in the relations of Americans and Japanese is dawning in California; and if in California then may we not hope elsewhere, sooner or later? I

say "dawning"; that is hopeful, but before the full day can come much must be done.

To remove the irritation which has been engendered by our treatment of the Japanese in the past, to prevent irritation in the future, and to create permanent relations of friendship between the two nations, two things are needed.

1. The first is, such Federal legislation as will give the National Government control of aliens.

It has been a weakness of the Federal Government from the beginning that the Constitution did not expressly make treaties with foreign nations binding upon the States. As the situation now is, the President may negotiate a treaty with a foreign government in which protection of the rights of its citizens coming to this country is duly guaranteed. But when those citizens of that foreign nation arrive, the State in which they locate may enact laws depriving them of those rights; and our National Government is helpless. The foreign government calls the attention of the President to the fact that its citizens have had their rights violated on our soil, and asks for redress. The President replies:

I am sorry; but the dual form of our Government, and the fact that the Constitution does not forbid

States from making laws contravening national treaties, tie my hands. I can do nothing. There is no redress for you. You cannot seek redress from the offending State because you can have no dealing with any of our States, but only with the National Government; and the National Government is powerless in the case, as I have explained.

Can we conceive of the Executive of a great nation being placed in a more humiliating position? And yet this is virtually the position in which President Wilson stands today, and in which every President stands all the while, so long as this anomalous condition of things, this anomalous relation between the Federal Government and the individual States, is allowed to continue. President Wilson is not the first Chief Executive that has been brought into trouble by it. President Harrison found himself in a similar predicament. During his administration the Federal Government found it impossible to take steps to punish those guilty of the "Mafia lynchings" (the lynchings of eleven Italians in New Orleans, March 14, 1891), because it was held that the statutes of Louisiana should govern the case. The situation between our National Government and the Italian Government became so strained over the matter that diplomatic relations were severed.

What is needed to prevent such serious complications from arising at any time between the United States and other governments? What is needed to prevent the possibility of serious trouble developing between us and Japan over the California situation—that is, over the fact that the California Legislature has enacted legislation which seems to contravene a Federal treaty?

At a meeting of distinguished clergymen and laymen of this country and of missionaries from the Orient, held in New York in September, 1916, at the invitation of the World Alliance and the Federal Council of Churches of America, there was a full and careful discussion of the subject of the present condition of aliens in the United States and of the helplessness of the National Government to give them adequate protection because of the lack of needed Federal legislation. The meeting passed the following resolution without a dissenting vote:

Whereas, the American Bar Association has endorsed a bill (H. R. 21073) for an Act of Congress, providing that "any act committed in any State or Territory of the United States in violation of the rights of a citizen or subject of a foreign country secured to such citizen or subject by treaty between the United

States and such foreign country, which act constitutes a crime under the laws of such State or Territory, shall constitute a like crime against the peace and dignity of the United States, punishable in like manner as in the courts of said State or Territory, and within the period limited by the laws of such State or Territory, and may be prosecuted in the courts of the United States, and, upon conviction, the sentence executed in like manner as sentences upon conviction for crimes under the laws of the United States.

Therefore, Resolved that this Conference of men, interested in the observance by the United States of all its treaty obligations and responsibilities, urges upon Congress the enactment of the above law during the coming session.¹

¹ The constitutional question here involved, as to the right of a State to enact legislation conflicting with treaties made between the United States and foreign governments, has been frequently discussed. It is the view of high legal authorities that such State legislation is invalid. The arguments in support of this view are ably set forth by Hon. Frank B. Kellogg in his address as president of the American Bar Association delivered in Montreal in 1913, and he states his conclusion as follows: "I am convinced that there can be no serious doubt that the Federal Government may, by treaty, define the status of a foreign citizen within the States, the places where he may travel, the business in which he may engage, the property he may own, both real and personal, and the devolution of such property upon his death; that such a treaty constitutes the supreme law of the land; and that a state law contravening such a treaty is void and will be so declared by the courts in a suitable action." (*Rep. Am. Bar Ass'n.*, 1913, p. 333.)

This view set forth by Mr. Kellogg may be correct. But even if so, the clearest way out of the impasse in which the National Government finds itself, would seem to be the enactment

Unfortunately the law was not enacted during that session. The delay is greatly to be regretted because, until we have such a law, injustices to aliens among us are at any time liable to arise which the National Government may not be able to correct, and which may involve our nation in serious difficulties with some foreign Power.

How serious are such possibilities may be seen from the following facts:

The Government of the United States is bound by numerous treaties respecting the rights of aliens. For example, the treaty of 1871 with Italy contains the following reciprocal pledges:

The citizens of each of the high contracting parties shall receive in the states and territories of the other the most constant protection and security for their persons and property, and shall enjoy in this respect the same rights and privileges as are or may be granted to the natives on their submitting themselves to the conditions imposed upon the natives.

The personal and property rights of aliens have been repeatedly violated, and, as a result, the friendly relations existing between the United States and foreign countries have been jeopardized.

of such legislation as that suggested by the American Bar Association, described above.

Ex-President Taft has given a list of seventy-three aliens of different nationalities lynched or murdered in other ways between 1885 and 1910, in addition to those who were wounded. Thousands have been driven from their homes and their property destroyed by lawless mobs.

In all these cases the Federal Government has acknowledged its responsibility by paying indemnities, but it has not been able either to give protection in case of threatened danger or of prosecution of those who committed the crimes, owing to lack of legislation authorizing the Federal authorities to take the needful actions. In support of this statement the words of four recent Presidents are offered:

President Harrison, just after the Mafia case at New Orleans in 1891, said:

It would, I believe, be entirely competent for Congress to make offences against the treaty rights of foreigners domiciled in the United States cognizable in the Federal courts. This has not, however, been done, and the Federal officers and courts have no power in such cases to intervene either for the protection of a foreign citizen or for the punishment of his slayers.

President McKinley, in his annual message of December 5, 1899, used these words:

JAPANESE QUESTION IN CALIFORNIA 181

For the fourth time in the present decade the question has arisen with the Government of Italy in regard to the lynching of Italian subjects. The latest of these deplorable events occurred at Tallulah, Louisiana whereby five unfortunates of Italian origin were taken from jail and hanged.

. . . The recurrence of these distressing manifestations of blind mob fury, directed at dependents or natives of a foreign country, suggests that the contingency has arisen for action by Congress in the direction of conferring upon the Federal courts jurisdiction in this class of international cases where the ultimate responsibility of the Federal Government may be involved.

President Roosevelt, in his annual message of December, 1906, said:

One of the greatest embarrassments attending the performance of our international obligations is the fact that the statutes of the United States are entirely inadequate. I earnestly recommend that the criminal and civil statutes of the United States be so amended and added to, as to enable the President, acting for the United States Government, which is responsible in our international relations, to enforce the rights of aliens under treaties.

As has already been said, the plain need seems to be, Federal legislation giving the National Government control over all aliens. This is what the American Bar Association urges. This is

what President Taft desired during his administration, and has advocated ever since. In an address delivered in Washington, October 20, 1914, he declared that this whole difficulty of the National Government may be solved, and ought to be solved, by

a simple statute of a dozen lines enacted by Congress, giving to the President the necessary authority to institute proceedings whereby foreigners in the United States shall receive the protection guaranteed by the treaties between this government and the nations to which they bear allegiance.

2. The second thing necessary in order to bring about an adjustment of the difficulties which have arisen between us and Japan and to prevent future trouble, is a satisfactory immigration policy.

Immigration is a need of this country, but it also is a possible danger. Every nation has a right to protect itself. For any nation to throw open its doors and allow unlimited and overwhelming numbers of people to come in, whose civilization, race, language, customs, ideals of government and ideals of life are radically different from its own, would be to commit suicide. If any nation is to live as a nation, preserving its

own genius and carrying out the ideals of its founders, it must receive into itself only so much of immigration as it can assimilate, as it can politically and socially digest and make a real part of itself.

This is something that the United States in the past has not always borne in mind. We have said:

Ours is a land of freedom; we have plenty of territory; let us welcome everybody who cares to come; let ours be a sort of land of refuge, a sort of land of promise, to the people of all countries.

Thus we have made almost no restrictions. The policy has not been a safe one. Its result has been, that we have admitted many undesirable elements—much ignorance, and not a little criminality and pauperism. And, what is perhaps even worse, from some countries we have admitted immigrants in enormous numbers, numbers so great that it has not been possible for us properly to assimilate them. Settling in localities by themselves they have preserved their own foreign speech, established schools, churches, and associations of their own kind, taken pains to cherish the customs and institutions of the lands from which they came, and thus have built up in various parts

of the country numbers of essentially foreign communities, really un-American communities, communities in the nation but not really of it. Thus we have come to present to the world the spectacle of a great American Republic with large sections of territory sprinkled over with dots and patches of little Irelands, little Polands, little Germanys, little Italys, *et al.* Such a condition of things is a peril to any nation.

This experience of the older States of the East has not been without its effect upon the newer States of the Pacific Coast. When they came into existence they possessed vast areas of unoccupied territory. Their immediate and pressing need, and a need likely to continue indefinitely, was for immigrants. It was not long before the questions confronted them:

What kind of immigration? and under what conditions? Shall we do as our sister States in the East did in their earlier days—open our gates to immigrants coming from whatever source they may, and in whatever numbers? If we do this, what will be the result? The Eastern States front on Europe. The immigrants that came to them were Europeans, people of the same race with themselves, of the same religion and the same civilization. We front on Asia. The immigrants that naturally offer themselves to us

JAPANESE QUESTION IN CALIFORNIA 185

are Orientals, not only from Japan, but also from China with its population of hundreds of millions, and indeed from India with its other hundreds of millions. These Oriental peoples are of a different race from our own, a different religion and a different civilization. If there was danger in the East in receiving too many Europeans, will there not be danger, greater danger, in the West, in receiving too many of the peoples of Asia, with the possibility, nay the certainty, of their settling largely in groups, and thus creating large numbers of communities, not only of Japanese but of Chinese and Hindus, who will long remain unassimilated, un-Americanized, foreign, only to a limited extent in sympathy with our institutions and our ideals, and often antagonistic to them?

I say these are the questions that have confronted the Pacific Coast States from the beginning, and that confront them still. It is easy to see that they are serious.

What then does the Pacific Coast need?

Does it need to exclude all Orientals? No, not any more than the older States have needed in the past, and need today, to exclude all Europeans.

Says Dr. Clay MacCauley, whose knowledge of both America and Japan is very large:

I am confident that the present American-Japanese problem is only the most recent phase of the nation-old, ever recurring difficulty which has become

prominent in America whenever newcomers into the nation (whether Irish, German, Italian, Slav, or Japanese) have been numerous enough to be felt on the rivalries and competitions of the nation's industries and commerce. It should always be remembered that in this problem the primary factor, or element, is economic, not racial. In fact, I am confident that were the economic source of antagonism absent from, or not acute in, the contact of Americans and the Japanese immigrants, the racial differences of the two peoples would not keep them seriously alien, at least from a friendly social intercourse, even though the most intimate relationships of life, by preference among both peoples, might not generally be sought.

I am convinced that the Pacific Coast anti-Japanese agitation should receive earnest and intelligent attention throughout America. This attention should have the twofold purpose of finding, first, an adequate relief for whatever real trouble threatens, or has befallen, the industries and commerce and working people, particularly of California, because of an alien immigration; and, second, the determination, in finding the needed relief, to enact nothing which shall work injustice to the Japanese as such. Anti-racial discrimination, originating under the ideals pervasive in American democracy, has no rightful place in the legislation of the American people.

Of course the right and duty of self-protection is always present both with individuals and with commonwealths; but I know of nothing in the present emergency in America which on behalf of self-preservation would justify an anti-racial or an anti-national discrimination.

JAPANESE QUESTION IN CALIFORNIA 187

Moreover, beyond the demand of justice and conformity to the American ideals of human relationships, lies the mighty present movement of Humanity as a whole into Internationalism. No land can now be made a closed land to the rest of the world and then increasingly prosper. Not only, therefore, do American ideals, but also the needs of America's further prosperous development, require that the present world-encompassing internationalism should be utilized, and impartially dealt with, in whatever may be done by Americans to guard and advance their industrial and commercial welfare. This requirement would not prevent such a revision of America's immigration laws as would impose upon immigrants very exacting conditions in connection, for instance, with health, freedom from crime, possession of a certain amount of money with certain intellectual culture and with purposed loyalty to the laws of the land. And along with these conditions there might be yet other limiting measures put upon immigrants in order better to guard existing industries and commerce from serious disturbance. Indeed, any strictures upon the entrance of aliens into the country might legitimately be enacted except those drawn from nationality or race. But to introduce into the immigration question discriminations that are purely national and racial when all other reasons for objection are absent, cannot fail to produce interracial and international alienations and bitternesses which are unnecessary and seriously evil.

After many years of acquaintance with the Japanese people I am entirely convinced that it would not be harmful to America if Japanese as well as European

newcomers were permitted, in reasonable numbers, to find a place in her industrial system, gradually to become co-labourers with the American people, and in time become assimilated into full American citizenship.¹

The thought that intelligent and otherwise well qualified Japanese ought to be debarred from entering the United States or refused naturalization as citizens, simply on account of their nation or race, is an idea born of ignorance, insularity of outlook, and prejudice. It is not in harmony with the mind of the wisest, most broad-minded, and most truly patriotic Americans. President Roosevelt voiced a far wiser and a far truer Americanism when he wrote in his Message to Congress of March, 1906:

"I recommend to the Congress that an act be passed specifically providing for the naturalization of Japanese who come here intending to become American citizens."

The need of the Pacific Coast and of all the rest of the country is, a national immigration policy of proper limitation, proper restriction, shutting out the morally, intellectually, and physically unfit

¹ *The American-Japanese Problem as a Race Question*, pp. 9-10, 19-20.

of every land, and admitting the fit from every nation in such numbers as shall be safe—that is, in such numbers as we can assimilate and make into true Americans, Americans intelligent concerning our national ideals and loyal to them.

Is it possible to frame such a policy?

Unhesitatingly I answer Yes. During the past three or four years there have been placed before the nation several drafts or outlines for a general immigration law, which have been formed by men or committees of large knowledge, and which there is every reason to believe would meet the needs of all parts of the country.

To one of these I wish to invite particular attention. It is the plan proposed by Dr. Sidney L. Gulick, of New York, formerly for many years an educator in Japan, who has a knowledge of the Orient equalled by few men, and who has given the most careful and extended study to our whole national immigration problem, especially in its relation to California and Japan. The confidence with which I speak of Dr. Gulick's plan is based not simply upon my own judgment, but also and still more on the fact that it has received the unqualified approval of nearly all the men in this country who are best qualified to judge of its

merits. What is also of the very highest importance, it would be accepted by the Japanese Government as a satisfactory solution of the immigration problem pending between that nation and our own.

Very briefly stated (and partly in his own words), Dr. Gulick's plan is as follows:

The Pacific Coast States fear an invasion of Asiatic immigrants, and rightly demand protection from such a danger.

The problem is how to provide for both—how to protect the Pacific Coast, without resorting to race discriminatory legislation, obnoxious to Asiatics because humiliating.

The solution lies:

1. In the regulation of all our immigration—all immigration into this country from whatever land—on a common principle.
2. In the adequate training of all immigrants for citizenship.
3. In the giving of citizenship to all who adequately qualify, regardless of their race, or the nation from which they come.

This last point is important, because when immigrants have become citizens they are then practically safe from discriminatory legislation.

By the Constitutions of all our States all citizens have equal rights. No State would dare to single out for less favourable treatment than the rest any one class or section or part of the people within its borders to whom it had granted full citizenship. The reason why the California Legislature dared even to attempt to segregate Japanese children from others, and to prevent Japanese workmen from using power engines, and to demand from Japanese fishermen ten times as high a license as from others, and to place a special poll tax upon all Japanese, and to deny to them the privilege of buying and owning real estate, was because they were aliens—they were not able to claim the protection of citizenship.

Why should there be longer delay in extending to the Japanese within our borders such just and reasonable protection? It is gratifying to see that many are asking this question in all parts of the country, including California. In San Diego a movement has already been started, and a society has already been formed called "The American Defence League," looking toward granting to the Japanese of the State who are qualified, full American citizenship. Many of the most influential men of the State, like Judge Evans of the

Riverside Superior Court and President Scherer of the Pasadena Throop Institute of Technology, are urging that in recognition not only of their intellectual and industrial qualifications, but also of their loyalty and patriotism as shown in their Red Cross activity and their readiness to enlist under the American flag, citizenship should be granted them.

Now that Japan has sent a distinguished Commission to this country to consult with our Government regarding matters of peace and co-operation between the two nations, is not this an opportune time for Americans to solve the only real cause of irritation felt by Japanese in regard to American-Japanese relations? As Dr. Gulick has well said:¹

Has not the time come for Congress to pass a law providing that citizenship by naturalization may be given to all who qualify, regardless of race? We know what Japan desires. May we not take the friendly step and grant the privilege wholly of our own initiative, basing our action upon the fundamental principles of democracy and international friendship? In self-consistency and international good-neighbourliness, should we not either refuse citizenship to all non-European stock, such as Finns,

¹ See *The Christian Work*, September 15, 1917.

JAPANESE QUESTION IN CALIFORNIA 193

Hungarians, and Turks (none of these are properly Europeans), to all Semites (who are racially Asiatics), to Mexicans and South Americans (whose blood is to a greater or less degree non-European), and to all Africans; or else should we not grant citizenship to every person who qualifies, regardless of race? Must we not either go forward or backward? At present the Chinese are excluded from citizenship by a specific Act of Congress (1882), while Japanese are excluded by a recent and doubtful interpretation of another Act (that of 1875). Such persons are not receiving "equal protection of the laws." In order that the Fourteenth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States shall be properly carried out, should not Congress forbid States from passing laws discriminating against aliens? Should not Congress at least forbid States from discriminating between aliens of different races? Should not Americans now urge Congress promptly to amend the naturalization law of 1906 by the addition of a provision that any alien regardless of his race who fulfills the specified conditions, shall be naturalized? This act would be hailed with joy by China as well as by Japan. The invidious and humiliating discrimination would be removed which would give intense relief to their wounded sense of honour. Its enactment would not add one Chinese or Japanese to our population nor bring any injurious result whatever to our land.

It has been already pointed out that, for safety, the immigrants from any land should be limited to the number that we can Americanize. How

many will that be? What rule should guide us? This: Let the maximum permissible annual immigration from any people (as the Japanese, the Italians, or any other) be a definite per cent. (say five), of the sum of the American-born children of that people, plus those from that people who have already become naturalized American citizens.

In other words, the proven capacity for genuine Americanization on the part of those already here from any land, should be our measure of the further immigration which we should permit from that land. Newcomers make their first contact with America through those already here who speak their language. The Americanization, therefore, of newcomers from any land depends largely on the influence of those already here from that land. The number of newcomers annually admissible from any land, therefore, should be closely dependent on the number of those who have been here five years or more, and have actually become American citizens. These know the language, customs, and ideals of both peoples, ours and theirs, and hence are qualified to help those newly arriving to understand American ways and institutions and ideals.

Perhaps this very brief sketch of Dr. Gulick's plan is all that is required here. A full and complete description of it may be obtained from the author.¹

It only remains to be added, that the plan seems to possess several very distinct and important merits.

1. Those who have considered it most carefully almost unanimously believe it to be workable.

2. It is obviously fair. It discriminates neither for nor against any people or race. It will admit Europeans, as many as we have means to Americanize, but no more. It will admit Japanese and Chinese, but only so many as we can Americanize.

3. It will be safe. It will allow no section of the country to be flooded with undesirable immigrants either from Europe or Asia.

4. It is hoped and believed that it will be found satisfactory to California and the other States of the Pacific Coast, as well as to the rest of the country.

5. Finally it has the great merit that it meets the entirely just demand of Japan, that in our

¹ Dr. Gulick's address is 105 East 22d St., New York.

legislation we shall not discriminate against her people, but shall accord to them the same rights we do to the people of the other great nations of the world.

CHAPTER XIV

THE MENACE OF JAPAN IN THE PHILIPPINES

Is There Danger of Japan Attempting to Seize the Philippine Islands?

THERE are persons who tell us that we are in danger of losing the Philippines at the hands of the Japanese. Even some who perceive the folly of apprehending an invasion of America, are disposed to believe that Japan may be plotting to seize our island possessions which lie so much nearer to her shores.

Let us try to see just what is the Philippine situation, and find out, if we can, whether we are in danger in that quarter.

First of all, have we any reason to believe that Japan wants the Philippines? Her leading men have said numberless times that she does not. The location of the islands is in the tropics. But the Japanese people are accustomed to a temperate

climate, and do not like a tropical. So there is reason to believe that they would not go to the Philippines in any considerable numbers to settle even if the nation possessed them. They have far better opportunities in Korea and Manchuria. But if there were little or no settlement of Japanese in the Philippines, what benefit could Japan derive from them. If they have been an expense to the United States could they be anything else but an expense to her?

Again: Could Japan take them from us by force, even if she wanted to? Of course she would first have to sink our fleet, which, as we have seen, is from two to three times as strong as her own. Furthermore, the islands are strongly fortified; the fortifications which we have built on Corregidor, guarding Manila Bay, are among the most perfect and powerful in the world.

And even if by some sudden stroke she were able to capture Manila, the capital city, that would mean little, for she would still have before her the gigantic task of subduing the islands, in which undertaking she would be compelled to fight not only the United States but the whole Filipino people. After her long and trying experience in Formosa we may be sure that she will not be eager

to attempt the same kind of thing on a larger scale in the Philippines.

But the main thing is that whether she were able to capture the Philippines or not, if she made the attempt, that would be war with us; and that would mean conflict with a nation possessed of such resources in men, munitions, and money that there could be only one possible outcome to it. In the end the war would go against her. She would have to give up the islands, even if for a time she had held them by the power of her guns. America would fight with an energy that nothing could withstand, and for years if necessary, and if necessary would sink half her enormous wealth in building fleets and equipping armies, rather than suffer a foot of soil above which her flag floated to be torn from her by force.

In such a war both nations would lose vast treasure. Both would pour out nobody can tell how much blood. Hate, which generations of time could not overcome, would be kindled between two great peoples that ought to be friends forever. There would be much suffering here, but not a hundredth part as much as in Japan. She would lose her commerce. Her coasts would be blockaded. Her manufactures would be para-

lysed. She would be plunged into bankruptcy. Her people would starve. And all for what? For nothing, and worse than nothing!

Does any sane man believe that the Japanese people today or tomorrow or in a thousand years will elect to plunge into such a sea of horrors and of ruin for the sake of trying to seize a group of islands which they well know they cannot get any possession of that will be permanent, and which if obtained would be to them a perpetual expense, burden, anxiety, and peril?

Charles Lamb's Chinaman, burning down his house to roast a pig, would be a paragon of wisdom compared with any Japanese general or admiral or statesman who would advocate burning down the edifice of his nation's present splendid strength and prosperity for the sake of stealing from a friendly sister nation something which would be at best of only doubtful value if obtained.¹

¹ Some of our hostile critics of Japan, who are so ready to see any possible "mote" in her eye while unable to discern anything even so large as a "beam" existing in our own, are discovering a source of danger to this country in the fact that early in the war Japan took from Germany several groups of small islands in the Southern Pacific Ocean, and still retains them in her possession. But what are the facts?

Why did she take these islands? Because as an ally of Great Britain it was her duty to enter the war, and the particular task

No, we may all be perfectly sure that if Japan is not going to attempt such an infinitely stupid and ruinous enterprise as that of invading the United States, neither is she going to undertake the only slightly less stupid and in the end not at all less

assigned to her was to drive Germany out of the Orient. This task she performed promptly by capturing Kiao-chau, Germany's stronghold in China, and these island groups in the Pacific, and by assisting Great Britain in clearing every German warship and gun from the waters of the Orient. This was an invaluable service to the Allies, because it enabled Great Britain at once to withdraw her navy and her merchant marine from the Orient and from the entire Pacific and use them in her home waters where they were so much needed.

What is Japan doing with these islands? Holding them, as it is proper that she should, until the end of the war, when of course their final disposition will be arranged by the conference of nations that will be called upon to settle so many other questions raised by the war.

But may they not be assigned to Japan? And if they are, will they not be a menace to the United States?

This is a strange question. Is it possible that the United States, which is certain to have a leading voice in all matters of the kind, will consent to any arrangement that our Government regards as a menace to our safety?

Furthermore, how is it possible for the islands to be a menace to us, whoever may possess them? Nobody dreamed that they were a menace to us when Germany held them; will they be any more so if they are assigned to Japan?

What kind of islands are they? All except the German section of New Guinea are very small; most are volcanic or else scarcely more than bare reefs of coral; many are uninhabited; some are inhabited by cannibals; the total population of all the groups is only a few hundred thousand, and the agricultural and commercial importance of all is well nigh negligible. Their chief value

ruinous job of wresting from the United States the Philippine Islands. The nation that has accomplished the wonderful things which with amazement the world has seen Japan accomplish in the past fifty years, is not a nation of fools,

is as coaling stations for ships which may have occasion to sail in the little frequented regions where they lie.

Where are they located? Near us? On the contrary, they are in that part of the Pacific which is farthest from us. They are Asiatic, not American. They are much nearer to Japan than to us, and of course, therefore, if location has anything to do with giving claim, Japan has a much better claim upon them than we. Indeed, since they are in the Orient and we in the Occident why should we regard ourselves as having any claim upon them at all?

The fact is there is no more ground for our regarding the possession of these or any other Asiatic islands by Japan as a danger to us, or a violation of our rights, than there is for her regarding our possession of the Aleutian or any other American islands as a danger to her, or a violation of her rights.

We are told that their possession by Japan would be a menace to the Philippines. But most of the islands are not so near the Philippines as is Japan, and therefore could not be a menace unless Japan is. Nor are they anything like so near as is China, or French Indo-China, or Hong-Kong, the British Gibraltar of the East. Are these a menace to the Philippines?

If there is in us as a nation any fairness or justice at all we must recognize that the Pacific Ocean belongs as much to Japan as it does to us, and that she has as much right to obtain possession in it as we have. And certainly if we may cross the Pacific to Japan's side and seize and hold such large and valuable islands as the Philippines, we can have no reason for complaint if the Conference of nations which will sit at the close of the present war shall deem it just to assign to Japan the groups of almost worthless barbarian islands on her own side of the Pacific, which she has taken from Germany.

and is not going to become such. It is we who are fools when we dream that her leaders, the peers of our own sanest statesmen, are plotting and planning such infinitely idiotic things.

This, then, is one side of the Philippine matter. Japan is not going to take our islands from us, or make any attempt to do so. If any among us has dreamed such nightmare dreams we may dismiss them and be at rest.

But there is another side to the matter that is not a phantasy. This side must be faced and we want to know how to face it wisely. The Philippines are in our possession and will remain so until we ourselves dispose of them. What are we going to do with them?

Would it be a loss to us as a nation if they should pass out of our possession? If so, in what respect?

Leading men among us of all parties do not hesitate today to confess that from the beginning these islands have been to us financially an expense, politically a burden, and militarily a peril. When, excited by the militaristic fever and the expansionist ambition that swept over the nation in connection with the Spanish War, we seized those remote possessions, and imposed upon them our rule, contrary to the will of their people, we thought

we were doing something for our advantage. Eighteen years have passed, and now we see how mistaken we were.

By our action we stultified ourselves as a liberty-loving people, trampling under foot before the eyes of all nations the principle for which we had always stood, the principle on which our nation was established, that just government can be founded only on the consent of the governed.

Further than that, by our action we struck the severest blow possible to our long-cherished Monroe Doctrine; for if we claimed the right to reach across half the diameter of the earth and seize lands in Asia, by what principle of justice could we longer forbid the nations of Europe, or of Asia for that matter, from obtaining possessions in America?

Still further, by seizing those far distant islands we greatly weakened ourselves as a military and naval power in the world. Competent military and naval authorities tell us that in order to defend our country plus the Philippines we require fully twice as large a navy and twice as large an army as to defend our country alone. Thus our stolen islands are a peril as well as a burden.

We try to console ourselves and we apologize

to others, for our blunder and our wrong, by the plea that we are benefiting the Filipino people. But are we? I do not wish to answer that we are not, but I do wish to ask very seriously, Are we sure that we are? If we are benefiting them in some ways, are we not more than offsetting this by the injuries we are doing them in others? Who should be the judge? Should not the Filipino people themselves? What do they say? Almost to a man they declare that their freedom, their independence, the right to shape their own career for themselves, are to them more precious than all the boons that we have conferred, or that we possibly can confer. And if we were in their place would we not say the same?

The thing then for us to do, if we desire to show ourselves an honourable and just nation, surely is faithfully to carry out our present plan of putting into their hands more and more power and responsibility year by year, and soon, very soon, without any unnecessary delay, granting them the boon which above all others they crave, their own full freedom.

The questions are asked: Will this be safe? Are the Filipino people competent to rule themselves?

I answer, Yes, more competent than any foreign nation in the world is to rule them. New York City makes many blunders, and under the influence of its Tammany and other bosses does many corrupt and evil things. But it rules itself better than it could possibly be governed by Philadelphia, or San Francisco, or Montreal, or Paris, or any foreign city. For centuries England has declared that Ireland was unfit to govern herself. Now the whole world sees that compelling her to submit to alien rule, even the supposedly very wise rule of England, has been a terrible mistake. The worst blunders and scandals connected with the government of the Philippines since they came into our possession have been the work of the Americans, not of the Filipino members of the Government who knew the needs of their people as we could not, and who were interested to guard those needs. Illustrations of our American blunders, not to call them by any worse name, are seen in the luxurious American summer capital established in the hills, and the famous (or infamous) Benguet Road.

I see not how any one can deny the capacity of the Filipino people for self-rule who has watched their history from the time when Emilio Aguinaldo

established his Republic, patterned after our own, down to the present; or who is acquainted with the Filipino leaders in the different departments of public life; or who has sat, as I have done, in the hall of the Philippine Legislature, and seen the quiet dignity, self-poise, intelligence, and efficiency with which these representatives of the people carry on their legislative work.

The question is asked: Will not the islands be seized by some other power, if we grant them independence?

Seized by what power? The one that our alarmists talk about is Japan. But we have already seen how groundless is that fear. From what other would there be danger? Germany? Neither Japan, nor Great Britain, nor the United States would permit Germany to seize them, even if she wanted to.

The simple, natural, reasonable, and, beyond question, effective course open for us to pursue in granting independence to the Philippines, is that of negotiating with several of the nations most interested (say Japan, Great Britain, France, and shall I not say Germany?) a treaty of neutrality for the islands. That will place their future beyond the possibility of danger from any outside

nation. Does any one say that treaties are only "scraps of paper" and of no value in these days? Let him not be deceived. After Europe's fearful experience of what breaking a treaty costs, we may be sure that nations in the future are going to hesitate longer before daring to violate an international agreement than they have ever done in the past.

There never will be war between Japan and the United States, unless we provoke and start it. Japan is too friendly to us ever to want war. But if she were not, she is too wise and far-sighted to plunge into a conflict from which all of her leaders clearly understand that she could never reap anything but the most terrible evil and disaster.

Even if a war should arise, started by us, Japan would never think of putting herself to the fatal disadvantage of fighting it on this side of the Pacific, at the distance of six thousand miles from her base of supplies and close to ours; nor would she fight it in the Philippine Islands, for the reasons already given. What she would do would be to compel us, if we wanted war, to attack her, and carry on the struggle at the breadth of a great ocean from our base of supplies, under the guns of

her own fortifications—we the aggressor, we the invader of her soil and she its defender. Under these conditions who would win? Of course she would win, as she ought.

These are the only conditions on which there will ever be war between the two countries. Is there an American living who is base enough and insane enough to dream of our ever attempting or desiring to invade Japan?

CHAPTER XV

CONCLUSION OF THE WHOLE MATTER

I HAVE now considered all the aspects which seem to me most important of the unfortunate trouble existing between the United States and Japan—a trouble that never ought to have arisen, that never need to have arisen; a trouble which in some of its aspects at least has been artificially and wickedly created; a trouble which every American who cares for the welfare of his country or for the peace of the world should do all in his power to heal.

I have given what seem to me solid and ample reasons for believing that Japan does not entertain, and never has entertained any intention or desire to invade either the continental United States or the Philippine Islands; and therefore that what is commonly thought of as the “Japanese Peril” is simply the wildest of dreams.

There is, however, a danger that is real.

CONCLUSION OF THE WHOLE MATTER 211

That danger is connected with the question of the continuance or non-continuance of the causes of irritation and distrust that have sprung up between the Japanese and this country. If short-sighted men among us shall persist in carrying on their evil work of filling our public mind with misrepresentations, suspicion, and fear of Japan, and if slights and injustices like those in California shall continue, the relations between Japan and this country may become strained to the breaking point, with the result of putting an end to our mutual friendship, then destroying the profitable and fast growing trade that exists between the two countries, then severing our diplomatic relations, and turning the two great neighbouring peoples that should be helpers of each other, into permanent foes and injurers of each other. This is the real peril that threatens.

If I may sum up in a few words all that I have been trying to say in this book, the words shall be these: Let us as a nation keep our sanity. Let us try to find out the truth about neighbouring peoples and not be deceived by prejudiced, short-sighted, or designing men. Let us give no countenance to jingo politicians or jingo newspapers,

or German plotters, who would stir up antagonism between us and a nation as highly civilized, as honourable, and as desirous of peace as ourselves.

Let us prize the fine friendship that has existed between this country and Japan for more than sixty years, and count him a public enemy who does anything to mar it.

Let us be as fair, courteous, and just in our treatment of the Japanese in California, as if they were Frenchmen or Russians or Germans or Englishmen.

Since we hold that Americans have a right to control the destinies of America, let us be just enough to acknowledge that Asiatics have an equal right to control the destinies of Asia.

Let us bear in mind that Japan has bound herself by the strongest treaties, both with us and with other nations, fully to respect the integrity of China and the open-door policy in her Chinese trade and commerce, and has given and is continuing to give numberless proofs of her desire to co-operate with and not to antagonize us, in that commerce and trade.

Let us frame for this country an immigration policy that shall be just to all nations and races and also just to ourselves; that shall neither shut

out desirable immigrants because of short-sighted national or race prejudice, nor admit greater numbers from any land than we can assimilate and mould into intelligent, liberty-loving, and loyal Americans.

Let us carry scrupulous honour and integrity into all our dealings with the Japanese Government, and confidently expect the same high honour and integrity in return.

And let us know that if an armed conflict ever arises between the two nations, it will not be a war of invasion of America, but, as already said, a war of aggression on our part, which we shall be compelled to fight at Japan's door, the crime of which will not be Japan's, but our own.

INDEX

A

Abbot, James F., 60
Advocate of Peace, 136
 Agriculture, 14
 Aguinaldo, Emilio, 206, 207
 Alaska, 148
 Alaska, Purchase of, 52
 Aliens, Federal Control of,
 needed, 175-196
 Aliens Lynched in U. S.,
 180
 American Bar Association, 177,
 178
 American Investments in
 China, 132-136
 Anglo-Japanese Treaty of 1905,
 130, 131
 Anti-Japanese legislation in
 California, 160-162
 Architecture in Japan, 11, 12
 Art in Japan, 8-13
 Aryan Blood in Japanese, 3
 Asia, the Civilization of, 1-4
 Asia, the mother continent,
 1, 2
Atlantic Monthly, 67

B

Banks in Japan with alleged
 Chinese cashiers, 23-25
 Barry, Richard, 118
 Baths and Bathing in Tokyo
 and Japan, 15
 Benguet Road, 206
 Boer War, 126
 Books, number of, published
 in Japan, 7

Boxer uprising in China, 33,
 34
 Bowles, Gilbert, 136
 Brown, Alice M., 154, 155
 Bryan, Secretary W. J., 162
 Buddhists contributing to
 build Christian churches, 48
 Burnett Immigration Bill,
 166

C

California, How much land do
 Japanese own in state? 155-
 158
 California Legislature, anti-
 Japanese bills, 160-162
 California, menace of Japan in,
 142-171
 Carving in wood, coral, etc.,
 11
 Ceramics in Japan, 11
 China, 90-101
 China, Agreement concerning,
 signed by Viscount Ishii
 and Secretary Lansing, 141
 China, integrity of, 128-
 141
 China, Japan's relations with,
 128-141
 Chinese Cashiers of Japanese
 banks, 23-25
 Chinese excluded from Amer-
 ica, 193
 Chira, Chugo, 167, 168
Christian Work, The, 192
 Civilization of Japan compared
 with that of Europe and
 America, 5-49

Civilization, Tests or marks of, 5-49
Collier's Weekly, 154, 155
 "Conclusion of the whole matter"—Summary of book, 210-213
 Constitution of U. S., Fourteenth Amendment, 193
 Corregidor and Manila Bay, 198
 Crime and Criminality, 17
 Crow, Carl, 59

D

Daniels, Secretary of Navy of the U. S., 113, 114
 De Forest, John H., 60, 81, 82
 Dickinson, G. Lowes, 12, 13
 Divorces in Japan, 20
 Dooley, Mr., 75, 76

E

East and West News, 135, 136, 167, 168
 Education in Japan, 6
 Education, Imperial Decree on, 30, 31
 Eliot, Charles W., 6, 41, 90, 91
Emden, German raider, 71
 Emerson, Study of, in Japan, 32
 Europe, her arrogance toward Asia, 1-3
Evening Post (New York), 61
 Expansion of United States to and upon the Pacific, 51-54

F

Federal Control of Aliens needed, 175-196
 Federal Council of Churches, 61, 62, 177, 178
 Feudal Age in Japan, 38

Filipinos and self-rule, 205-207
 Fillmore, President, 78
 Financial strength of Japan, 123-127
 Flowers, Montaville, 59
 Forestry in Japan, 15
 Formosa, 198
 Foster, David J., 61
 France, 135
 French Indo-China, 202

G

"Gentleman's Agreement" regarding Japanese immigration, 146, 147, 165, 167
 German Islands in South Sea captured by Japan, 200-202
 Germany, 70, 71, 90, 91, 95, 101, 115, 116, 117, 121, 131, 201, 207
 Germany driven from Orient and Pacific, 70, 71
 Great Britain, 115-119, 122, 135, 201, 207
 Great Britain, Alliance with Japan, 98, 99
 Griffis, William E., 60
 Gulick, Sidney L., 60, 138
 Gulick, Sidney L., his plan for control of immigration and naturalization of aliens, 189-195
 Guthrie, George W., 60, 85

H

Hale, Edward E., 30
 Harris, Townsend, 83
 Harrison, President, 180
Hartford Courant, 81
 Hawaiian Islands, 51, 54, 143-145, 151
 Hay, John, and the "Open Door" in China, 128-129
 Hayashi, Count, 39
 Hearn, Lafcadio, 32
 Henshaw, Judge F. W., 88-90

Herald (New York), 64
Hobson, R. P., 58, 59, 81, 82
Holt, Hamilton, 60
Honesty of Japanese, 20-30
Hong-Kong, 202
Hospitals in Japan, 16

I

Idealism of the Japanese, 9,
10
Illegitimate births in Japan,
19, 20
Illiteracy of Japanese in Cali-
fornia, 149, 150
Immigration, Japanese, 165-
170
Immigration Law, Need of a
better, 172-196, 212, 213
Immigration, Need of national
control of, 172-196
Immigration problem not rac-
ial but economic, 185-188
Independent, The, 150
Inlaying in gold and silver,
11
Integrity of China, 212
Intelligence of Japanese people,
6
Invasion of America by Japan,
how idea arose, 50-76
Invasion of America by Japan,
Is There Danger of? 80-
127
Irwin, Commodore, 65
Ishii, Viscount, V., 95-97,
140, 141
Ishii, Viscount and Secretary
Lansing, Agreement be-
tween regarding China, 141
Isobe cake vendor, 28, 29
Italy, Treaty with, 176, 179

J

Japan Advertiser, 92
Japan, her ideal of industrial
and commerical leadership,
80-83

Japan Mail, 92, 93
Japan Society Bulletin, 68
Japan's long friendship with
the U. S., 76-79
Japan's service in the Great
War, 70, 71
Japan, the Menace of in China,
128-141
Japanese; Are they warlike?
80-83
Japanese Civilization com-
pared with that of Occident,
5-49
Japanese civilization old, 3, 4
Japanese, discrimination
against, 165-170
Japanese in California: Are
they unsanitary? 151, 152
Japanese in California: Are
they illiterate? 149, 150
Japanese in California: Do
they crowd out whites? 155-
159
Japanese in California: Do
they lower wages? 151
Japanese Immigration, 165-
170
Japanese Invasion of America:
How the idea arose, 50-
76
Japanese, Number of, in Cali-
fornia, 147, 148
Japanese, Number of in West-
ern Hemisphere, 148
"Japanese Peril," 210
Japanese Special Commission
to U. S., 71, 95, 97
Jordan, David Starr, 41, 60,
90, 91

K

Kaneko, Viscount, 135, 136
Kasai, Jiuji G., 109-112, 120
Kawakami, K. K., 67, 105-
109, 150, 154, 162
Kellogg, Frank B., 178
Kennan, George, 60, 67
Kiao-Chau, China, 36, 70,
201

Knox, Secretary, 142
 Korea, 101, 164, 198
 Kuroda, Takumi, 118

L

Labor, Federation of, in California, 173, 174
 Labor Representatives from Japan visit America, 173
 Lamb, Charles, 200
 Landscape gardening in Japan, 11
 Lansing, Robert. Agreement with Japan regarding China, 141
 Law, public obedience to, in Japan, 5, 6
 Lawrence, David, 139
 Lea, "General" Homer, 58, 59
Literary Digest, The, 150
 Louisiana Purchase, 52

M

Mabie, Hamilton W., 60, 90, 92
 MacCauley, Clay, quoted, 185-188
 MacCauley, Clay, this book dedicated to
 Mackenzie, John D., 150
 McCormick, Frederick, 59
 McKinley, President, 180, 181
 "Mafia lynchings," 176, 180
 Magdalena Bay, 63
 Magnanimity of Japanese, 41-43
 Makarov, Russian Admiral, 36
 Manchuria, 101, 142, 164, 198
 Medical Science in Japan, 15, 16
 Methodist Doctor of Divinity quoted, 26, 27
 Mexico, 148

Mexico, Japanese in, 67, 69
 Mexico, territory obtained from, by U. S., 52
 Millis, H. A., 60, 147, 151
 Mills, Benjamin Fay, 163, 164
 Missionaries, American in Japan, resolutions of, 86, 87
 Mongolian blood in all Europeans, 3
 Monroe Doctrine, 52, 53, 139, 140, 204
 Monroe Doctrine of the Orient, 138, 139, 140
 Morals, Japanese Imperial Decree on, 30, 31

N

Napoleon, 122
 Naturalization of Japanese and other aliens, 188
 Navigation, 13, 14
 Navy of Japan described, 105-114
 Navy of United States described, 105-114
 Neutralizing the Philippines, 207, 208
 New Guinea, 201
New York Times, 141, 168
 Newspapers in Japan, 6, 7
 Nitobe, Inazo, 92
North American Review, 105

O

Okuma, Count, 94, 135, 168
 "Open Door" in China, 128-141, 212
Outlook, The, 70, 93, 94, 131, 150

P

Pacific, claimed as American Ocean, 56
 Pacific, demand for large navy on, 55

Painting in Japan, 9, 10
 Panama Exposition, 42
 Peace, love of, in Japan, 36-41
 Peking, military expedition to, to rescue Legations, 33-34
 Perry, Commodore, 40, 78, 83
 Philippine Legislature, 207
 Philippines, Conquest of by U. S., 126, 127
 Philippines, the Menace of Japan in, 197-209
 Philippines, Neutralization of, 207, 208
 Political freedom in Japan, 7
 Pottery in Japan, 11
 Prisoners of War, treatment of, by Japan, 33-36
 Prostitution, 18, 19
 Public order in Japan, 5, 6

R

Railroads in Japan, 15
 Red Cross, 174
 Red Cross in Japan, 46
 Representative government in Japan, 7
Review of Reviews, The, 150
 Roosevelt, Ex-President, 78, 88, 181, 188
 Root, Elihu, quoted, Foreword, vii
 Root-Takahira Agreement, 131
 Russell, Lindsay, 60
 Russell, Lindsay, Foreword of this book, v-viii
 Russia, 71, 99, 102, 135
 Russo-Japanese war, 34, 35, 37

S

San Diego American Defense League, 191, 192
 San Francisco Earthquake and fire, 42
 Sanitation, 15
 Sawayanagi, Dr., 135

Scherer, J. A. B., 60, 192
 Science in Japan, 8
 Scudder, Doremus E., 60
 Sculpture in Japan, 10
 Self-rule and the Filipino people, 205-207
 Sex morality in Japan, 18-20
 Shibusawa, Baron, 133, 134, 165
 Shibusawa, Baron, this book dedicated to
 Shima, George, the "Potato King," 158
 South Pacific Islands captured by Japan, 200-202
 Steiner, Jesse F., 60
 Summary of this book, 210-213
 Syndicate article slandering Japanese Special Mission, 71-74

T

Taft, Ex-President, 87, 180, 182
 Tammany (New York), 206
 Telegraphs, telephones, and mails in Japan, 15
 Temperance in Japan, 17
 Terauchi, Count, 134, 135
 Tokutomi, Mr., 93
 Toleration, religious, in Japan, 46-48
 Treaties as "scraps of paper," 208
 Trustworthiness of the Japanese Common People, 26-31
 Turtle Bay, 63-67

U

United States, expansion to and upon the Pacific, 51-54
 United States, her financial strength and resources, 125-127

Unity (Chicago), 105
 Usher, Roland G., 121
 Uyeno, Captain, 93

W

Wages: Do Japanese depress
 in California? 151
 War, Manner of carrying on,
 33-36
 Wars, Japan's long freedom
 from, 36-41
 Wilson, President, 95
 Wilson, President, unable to
 protect aliens, 175, 176

Woman in Japan, 43-45
 Woman's University in Japan,
 44
 Women, Employments open
 to in Japan, 44, 45
 Wright, Luke, 85

Y

Yamazaki, Consul-General, 147
 Yokoi Shonan, Japanese ethi-
 cal teacher, 40
 Yokohama residents, resolu-
 tions of, 85, 86

*A Selection from the
Catalogue of*

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS



**Complete Catalogues sent
on application**



DATE DUE

APR 20 1929

FEB 5 1930

JAN 4 1932

JAN 21 1959

NOV .1 '62

NOV 15 '62

PUBLISHED
P.R.
SEP 1 1927

UNIVERSITY OF THE PACIFIC LIBRARY



3 5132 00211 0419

20248

